

Vol. XXXVII

APRIL, 1960

No. 2

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: £1 *per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Tawa Flat, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Dulwich, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart — Rev. R. Donohoe, Kingston, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, R.I., V.F., Terang, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. J. Cass, Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Bunbury — Rt. Rev. C. Cunningham, V.G., Albany, W.A.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. G. Kane, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Leonora, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore — Rt. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., V.F., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Merewether Beach, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Pirie — Very Rev. W. Kain, R.I., V.F., Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton — Rt. Rev. D. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Very Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes — Rt. Rev. J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:

V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 89

The Pope's closing address of the Roman Synod (January 31, 1960).

THE ABORIGINAL CONCEPT OF THE SOUL.

Very Rev. Ernest A. Worms, S.A.C. 100

BISHOP JAMES QUINN: FROM DUBLIN TO BRISBANE.

Right Rev. Mgr. Cornelius Roberts, D.D., Ph.D. 116

THE DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER: A NEW HYPOTHESIS, IV.

Rev. Jerome Crowe, C.P. 123

MORAL THEOLOGY. Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 134

Intention when contracting marriage—Late arrivals at Mass—A case of servile work—Co-operation of husband in sinful act of wife.

CANON LAW. Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, P.C., D.C.L. 143

Is penalty of excommunication always incurred by Catholic party in marriage in non-Catholic church?—Is this penalty incurred by Catholic father who participates in marriage of Catholic daughter in non-Catholic church?

LITURGY.

Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 150

Renewing Hosts—Forty Hours Prayer—The Elevation Candle—Prayer for the Jews in Good Friday Liturgy.

HOMILETICS.

Rev. Kevin Walsh, D.D. 156

The Baptism of Christ.

NOTES.

163

A recent Theological Translation (Rev. Camillus Hay, O.F.M., D.D.)

BOOK REVIEWS.

169

But With the Dawn, Rejoicing (Kelly); The Curé of Ars and his Cross (La Varende); Canon Law Digest, IV (Bouscaren and O'Connor); Contemporary Moral Theology, Vol. I (Ford and Kelly); Heirs of St. Teresa of Avila (Nevin); The Life of Thomas Aquinas (Edit. Trans., Foster); The Living God (Guardini),

SHORT NOTICES.

115, 122, 133, 149, 162

Nilhil Obstat:

**THOMAS HARRINGTON
CENSOR DEPUTATUS.**

Imprimatur:

**✠ N. T. CARD. GILROY,
ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.**

1a die Aprilis, 1960.

Official Documents

Closing Address of the Roman Synod delivered by Pope John XXIII, in St. Peter's, Sunday, January 31, 1960.

Venerable Brethren, beloved sons:

The inauguration of the Roman Synod, last Sunday evening, in the Lateran Basilica, and its conclusion here at St. Peter's this evening fills Us with a great sense of gratitude to God and with exultant joy. The thought and the resolution to convoke a diocesan synod at Rome, the first in its religious history, invaded Our spirit with a simple immediacy, which was as strangely wonderful and touching as a ray from heaven. It sounded like an assuring and blessing voice from on high. We told you this in confidence at our first meeting in the Lateran Basilica.

Now, with the passing of one year, the synod has taken place; the volume which contains its precious ordinances is ready. Our being able to offer it here upon the tomb of St. Peter is a motive of extraordinary consolation. That consolation is all the greater, because We know that it is shared by all our children of Rome. Yes, it is a consolation felt by all, from Their Eminences, the members of the Sacred College of Cardinals, Our nearest collaborators in the government of the universal Church, down to the most modest representative of the clergy and people of Rome. The Roman people, indeed, is truly filled with joy at this great event, destined to mark a glorious and happy date in the religious history of our city.

The life of the Church, as year follows year, is the development of spiritual energies, of precious spiritual energies. They develop often through hard tribulation and the trial of sufferings. But again, thanks to God, the progress is made with upliftings of the spirit and with songs of joy. For every hour and for every circumstance we have at our disposal the ancient Psalter of David. That divine Psalter gives us the tone not only of elegies that heave like sighs from our heart, but it often also pours out immortal songs of joy.

Take Psalm 113: "In exitu Israel de Egyptu." It is all resonant with gratitude to the Lord, who shakes the earth, as if to rouse and encourage it, who changes the rock into pools of water, and the hard stone of the cliff into fountains.

And with what beauty the Psalmist continues: "Not to us, O Lord, not to us, but to thy name give glory, on account of

thy mercy and of thy faithfulness! Bless, O Lord, all those who fear thee, both the great and the little ones. The highest heaven, O Lord, thou hast made for thyself; the earth thou hast given to the children of men. It is not the dead that shall praise thee, O Lord. We the living are blessing thee; we will bless thee now and forever."

This sentiment of gratitude to the Lord for the grace diffused in the heart of all the clergy and of all the people of Rome in these days of the Synod is the first note of the Sunday gathering that has brought us together this evening. It is a pleasant note, of which each will carry away a memory that is tender and sweet.

For one who knows and loves his children, as the Bishop of Rome does, with appreciation and affection, it is easy to understand that this grace of the Synod has been a great and superabundant grace. It gives the lie to some assertions heard here and there, that in the great turmoil of human passions, seeking the good things of the earth, the presence and the voice of the Catholic Church, of the Roman Church, is losing its resonance and efficacy. The Synod reassures all persons of good faith that the Holy Roman Church holds, for activation in its pastoral service and apostolate of the future, precious reserves, which the preparation of the Synod and its new ordinances have brought to light, opening the hearts of all to splendid hopes.

Certainly the application of the Synodal Constitutions will be an immense work, in view of the rapid growth of Rome and the difficulty of assisting so many people from every point of Italy, to the extent of quadruplicating the population of 50 years ago. But who is strong like God our Lord the Saviour of the world? "Who is as the Lord our God, who dwells on high, and looks down on the lowly things in heaven and on earth?" (Ps. 112, 5-6)

Yes, the Synod has taken place, for the present span of life and for the immediate future. "We who live, bless the Lord." This is our first duty, to thank God and to take courage.

II

We are delighted above all at recognizing that this Roman Synod has become a great manifestation of spiritual power, to which We shall have recourse in following up Our efforts for the realization in Ourselves and around Ourselves of what is and

what should be order and sanctification throughout the whole process of our life in the Church.

At the inaugural ceremony of last Sunday, at St. John Lateran's, We referred to the majesty and beauty of the eight great frames of the Synod's work. On these frames the happy renewal of pastoral legislation distended itself, working on materials well prepared by the eight sub-committees, which, as it were, gathered together the cream of the cream of all sacred doctrine: theological, ascetical and pastoral. Here is the imposing series of those eight frames: (1) persons, (2) magisterium, (3) divine worship, (4) the Sacraments, (5) apostolic action, (6) Christian education, (7) things (churches, houses, monuments, and their administration), (8) assistance and beneficence.

Being as it is a great meeting point for all the regions of Italy and all the nations of the Catholic world, this immortal Rome of ours has at its disposal a numerous elite of ecclesiastics, noble and pious souls, expert as teachers and as distributors of sacred knowledge: theological, ascetical, liturgical, juridical and artistic. The city is also rich in persons having practical experience in specialized administrations of the economic order, that is, in reference to ecclesiastical goods.

You, venerable Brethren and beloved sons, will have occasion to estimate exactly the Synodal Constitutions when they are definitely approved. You will see the magnificent results of that individual and collective effort, which We have been able to follow closely, and to which Our Synodal consultors gave clear-sighted and learned consideration, such attention as comes from a heart solidly fixed and sacerdotally inclined, wisdom and wonderful discretion according to the spirit of the laws of the Lord.

It is quite the natural thing that all should be viewed in the light of the Christian faith and of sound doctrine. This, of course, is at the basis of individual, domestic and social order. It is a matter of fidelity to the teachings of Christ, in contraposition to every other conception of life and of history. The thought that directs us is that of St. Peter and St. Paul expressed in different ways in the letters which this Apostle and that wrote to the Galatians who were evangelized in those early days.

Of the thought of St. Peter We have already given a sample in Our Synodal conversations with the Clergy. St. Paul, in a great elucidation of a great question, namely, that of detachment from the Synagogue, in the spirit of Christian liberty,

recalls the history of the Patriarch Abraham. Abraham had offspring from two wives. There was the son of the slave-woman and the son of the promise. This ancient example is transparently applicable to our judgment of modern positions and the actual trends of present-day thought and life. To these two women correspond two cities bearing the same name of Jerusalem. The first is that of Mount Sinai. It begets into servitude and is denoted by Agar. It is a city that lives as a slave with its children. The other is the Jerusalem above, and she is our mother. She is not a woman belonging to slavery and the desert, but she is the daughter of the promise, whom we salute as our mother. St. Paul tells us the meaning of this allegory, and we know that the "allegory" of then is for twenty centuries the "reality" of perennial Christianity. As we are not children of the wilderness, but children of the promise kept by God towards all men of good will, we are all the more closely joined to our Rome, to this Jerusalem of the new covenant, who is our mother. She rejoices and exults in the freedom to which Christ has brought us back (Gal. 4, 31).

Venerable Brethren and beloved sons, let us thank the Apostles, Peter and Paul, who from the early days of the apostolic age reconfirm and encourage us in the profession of this great doctrine.

III

To the fundamental principles that regulate our conduct before God and before men there must be added **the true life** of practice. The practice of theological virtues must be a characteristic fruit of the Synod and must mark the exact line followed by every Christian and every perfect Catholic. Those three theological virtues are familiar to you all. They are faith, hope and charity. It is well, in naming them, to give them the adjectives that denote their conquering power. Faith is "firma fides," hope is "spes invicta," charity is "charitas effusa."

From the first murmurings of our infant tongues at the baptismal font to the last sighs of departing life, when we are returning to our heavenly Father, the Apostles' Creed is our companion. What a comfort it is for the priest who assists a dying man, who helps a sinner to make his last passage to God! Many and many of those who are on their death-beds look back on a life of sin. But what a comfort for the priest to recite with the dying man and for him those great words of the Ritual:

"Lord, this Christian man, who is about to die, is a poor creature who has been carried off by the bewitchments of youth and hardened by the obstinacy of old age. He has offended Thee many times; he has let himself be drawn by the enchantments of the world, by pleasures and by worldly concerns, 'tamen fidem non negavit'—he has not denied the faith. Be good and merciful to him."

But We look to the good Christian and to his faith. The good Christian, above all in the fervour of youth and of fructifying maturity, must make his faith profound and active. He must make it a light for his footsteps, a guide of his decisions, a force behind the fulfilment of his duties, both in the family and in the contacts of daily life. His faith must be an example and a stimulus.

"Iustus autem meus ex fide vivit—my just man shall live by faith" (Heb. 10, 33). For the intellectual man faith is like a bright lamp that helps the search after truth in every order of human investigation. The expression: "*Fides quaerens intellectum*" reflects its rays on many aspects of the scientific order. For a scientist it is not an honour to be or profess to be an unbeliever. Such an attitude rather manifests poverty of spirit, ignorance of self, dangerous presumption.

Then, there is the defence of the faith. This is the defence of a great fortress, and "*firma fides*" is the watch word. The spreading of the faith is an apostolate of shining merit; it is a perfection of the Christian spirit; it is a great title of honour in the Church of God, which looks for workmen dedicated to the good apostolate of conquest throughout the whole world.

But what must We say of those who join to the defence of truth and of the Catholic faith, the sacrifice of sufferings under persecutions equally, if not even more, ferocious than those of ancient times? With a great depth of feeling and with full effusion of heart, during the third day of the Synod, that distinguished assembly of Our clergy sent a vibrant salute of Catholic solidarity and fraternal encouragement to our brethren in tribulation, priests and laity of the Church of Silence.

These persecuted Christians are worthy of admiration and of compassion, but their persecutors deserve still more commiseration. In God, these are also our brothers, brothers who, after two thousand years of Christian history, are still so blind as not to realize that Jesus will always be the glorious and immortal King of the ages. They ignore the truth that our

faith is always the faith which shall overcome the world: "This is the victory that overcomes the world, our faith" (1 Jo. 5, 4).

"*Spes invicta.*" Christian faith has been well defined: "The substance of things that are hoped for, the proof of things that appear not" (Heb. 11, 1). There might seem, indeed, to be many reasons for discouragement. There is the violence with which anti-Christian error is being spread; there is the widespread infatuation regarding the new conception of earthly goods, as being the only reality (to the point of generating in some mortals the persuasion that heaven is empty); there is the notion that paradise for man is to be found on this earth, to be enjoyed without limitations of satisfaction, at least by the more audacious and most unscrupulous souls; there is the fallacy that every ideal here below must consist in the triumph of that triple concupiscence, the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh and the pride of life. The presence of such mentalities must surely sadden the soul and so dampen courage, as to threaten a victory for discouragement. But (let us be clear about it) this is for the weak, this is for tired souls, this is for the negligent.

— The words of Christ remain. They have filled the pages of the Gospel and have filled the world with infectious courage and with the joy that comes to every right conscience looking at human and Christian duty done. Untouched by discouraging forces is the assurance given by Christ's solemn declaration: "He who believes and is baptized" (that is, has passed through the holy door of his redemption) "shall be saved, but he who will not believe, shall be condemned" (Mark 16, 16). Amongst us, children of the light, even death does not bring fear to anyone, for theological faith rests with all security on the promises of Jesus; and hope is certainty. "I am the resurrection and the life" (Jo. 11, 25). What words these are! Whosoever adheres to them with faith and love shall live for ever. "Everyone who lives and believes in me shall never die" (ibid. 11, 26).

Having come to this reality of human and Christian life, it may appear strange that, after two thousand years of religious experience and of the Gospel spread and lived, there should still be anyone having the courage to tell us that the whole history of the Catholic Church, that all Christianity is only the continuation in the life of the world of a great myth or fable, which must be destroyed, in order to make a new world.

Let us leave such a notion in its infantile ingenuousness and continue in our exercise of hope. Hope is unconquered and

unconquerable, because its security is the word of our Lord in our regard, to us indeed belongs the great final consolation, while for unbelievers there is reserved the great delusion which is to result from the definite collapse of their efforts. Along the way, perhaps, we shall have to suffer some of the pressure of their persecution. "In mundo pressuram habebitis, sed confidite, ego vici mundum—in the world you shall have affliction, but be confident, I have conquered the world" (Jo. 16, 33). "These words I have spoken to you that my joy may be always in you and that it may be complete joy" (Jo. 15, 11).

"Charitas effusa." Indeed, our Lord, in continuing to make His amiable confidences to the disciples, said: "This is my precept that you wish well to each other as I have wished well to you." And the love that exists among you must be such as to dispose you to give even your lives for your friends (*ibid.* 15, 12-13). A truly great lesson is the lesson of charity. In it, in its practical application, is summed up the living substance of all Christianity, of the whole Church. The ecclesiastical legislation into which the Synodal Constitutions enter, has, as its central point of irradiation, charity. Charity is that which of servants makes friends of God, which makes of the priesthood a ministry for the benefit of the whole Church. And this is said not only of ecclesiastics, but, by means of their activity, it is true of the benefits that accrue to the whole social order. From the administration of the Sacraments, which is a distribution of heavenly grace falling like dew and fructifying the whole earth to the varied and manifold forms of social beneficence: worship, instruction, assistance, innumerable works touching all the varied circumstances of human life, all in charity becomes a noble and generous service, a holy and blessed deployment of sacerdotal energies. Sometimes and rather too often the spirit of the world is unjust in its appreciation of the benefits which the priesthood of Christ (distributed as it is in the various grades of secular and regular clergy, both equally worthy of respect) continues to confer on the civic and social order. In the distant days of Our youth the voice came from various quarters that priests should go out of the sacristy. To-day on the other hand someone or other, with humour changed, would wish the clergy to return to the sacristy and their liturgical functions. They forget that the clergy must follow the teachings and the examples of Jesus Christ, Who could visit the temple and pass nights in prayer, but by day was constantly occupied with the people, with those

people of Judea and Galilee, to whom He preached, whom He encouraged, on whom He lavished the service of His charity, even to the working of miracles. He was truly the good Shepherd that He declared Himself to be, full of solicitude for His flock.

Dear Brethren and sons, let us do everything to help our good and zealous and peace-loving clergy to sanctify themselves, so that the divine blessing accompanying their efforts may spread over all families through the work of a clergy, which is distinguished, laborious and beneficent.

To-day, Sunday, January 31, recurs the liturgical commemoration of St. John Bosco. This name is a poem of grace and of apostolate. From a little village of Piedmont he carried the glory and the successes of the charity of Christ to the most distant confines of the world. With his blessed name the Church associates his compatriot saints, Joseph Cottolengo and Joseph Cafasso. At the mention of this triad memories are aroused of innumerable humble and great priests, heroes of charity, who in Italy, in the old dioceses, as well as in all the nations of Europe and of the world, where the Church spreads out its tent-covers, constantly continue the manifestations of sacerdotal and pastoral zeal, ardent and faithful.

IV

Venerable Brethren and dear sons—One of the most characteristic aspects of the Gospel is that of “uniting.” In the Gospel according to John this doctrine, this grace, this beauty of union finds wonderful accents. They are gathered from the lips of Christ Jesus, from His divine Heart, from the flow of the blood of His sacrifice, and of His Sacrament. Jesus, the Divine Word united with His Father, became by Incarnation the eldest brother of the new family of redeemed humanity. This family is the Church, the Church one, holy, catholic and apostolic. By divine ordinance the Church is made to be diffused throughout the world, but its centre is at Rome where the barque of Peter landed. Here the barque remained anchored, not for a few years but for twenty centuries. Here it is still in solid and vigorous evidence. Rome has its clergy and its people, to whom St. Peter, its first Bishop, would certainly not refuse to transfer the titles of honour with which he saluted the first fervent communities of the orient: “A chosen stock, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people” (1 Petr. 2, 9).

Now, this diocese of Rome, reconsidering itself in this

Synod, turns the eyes of its clergy and of its people to the highest finalities of its religious and social life. It hastens with renewed fervour to go on with the task entrusted to it by the heavenly Province that made it the central point of Christianity.

In a few months Rome has prepared and celebrated its Synod. We pray the Lord to grant this city the grace and force to do honour to its good resolutions of being a city of holy life, of order and example, really and truly "in signum gentium."

After the Synod presided over by the Bishop of Rome, We beg the Lord Jesus, Founder of the Holy Church, to grant the further grace for His Vicar to convoke and celebrate the Oecumenical Council, which is to be the XXI of the series from the earliest centuries till now. It will be entitled the Second Council of the Vatican (*Vaticanum secundum*).

What is of importance is the preparation of this great event. It is a great event, for it must touch all the interests, all the vast and complex interests of the Universal Church, the Church of Christ, in relation to the realities of the present century, in the spirit and according to the design of the Divine Founder of the Church. That design He expressed in words of deepest confidence to His intimate friends in the mysterious discourse of the Cenacle, after the institution of the divine sacrament of love, and as He was on the point of crossing Cedron to begin the drama of great sorrow and great sacrifice.

V

The happy and blessed success of the Roman Synod opens Our heart to the expectation of help from the Lord for the Council. The approach to the preparation of the Council is already encouraging beyond all that could be foreseen.

Behold, children, courage and confidence in the Lord! Do not think that, in this matter of the celebration of the Council, the actual present *Servus servorum Dei*, who now watches over the sacred deposit of Peter's inheritance, holds fast to a hope and a desire of living long enough to see the end of the great project, to see the crowning of it with his own eyes. "God loves a cheerful giver" (2 Cor. 9, 7). This is a motive of tranquillity and peace for Our humble person. Moreover, "*iam voluisse sat est.*" For the glory of great enterprises the will to co-operate in them is sufficient.

We have confided the task of special assistance and heavenly protection for the future Council to three glorious saints, whose

tombs are a sacred treasure of this venerable Basilica of St. Peter, Christendom's greatest temple. The saints are two Patriarchs of the East and one of the greatest Popes of history. The names of the two Patriarchs, who were both Bishops of Constantinople, are St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. John Chrysostom. The Pope is St. Gregory the Great, a Roman by birth, as he was in thought and in heart. We can be very confident that from the regions above, as from the silence of their tombs, the other Pontiffs will unite in chorus beside the sacred memorials of St. Peter and St. Paul. It is here that they sleep in the sleep of peace, honoured by the official cultus of the Church: The Leos, the Gregories, St. Pius X, Blessed Innocent and other less known Pontiffs. The latest have left a specially vivid memory of their virtues in Our memory.

And now, We wish to turn everything into one great hymn of thanksgiving in which thoughts and hearts and voices join. Our thanks are for the gift of the Synod. We add a fervent prayer of supplication for new graces in the future, imploring help from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten of the Father and our eldest brother, Eternal Pontiff of the world redeemed by Him. We address Him by the title which St. Peter loved to give Him: "Divine Shepherd and Bishop of our souls."

The experience of the first year of Our pastoral solicitude has given us the sensation of a certain vague feeling in some devout and pious souls leading them to particular devotions and new titles, to practices of worship having a local character. They create the impression of giving rein to fancy rather than to concentration of the spirit. Our advice is to keep yourselves familiar with what is more simple and more ancient in the practice of Holy Church. As we learn from the Gospel, our Lord Jesus Christ taught only one prayer, and that is the "Our Father." What a sublime prayer! It comprises everything and is never exhausted. St. John has preserved for us the text of the prayer addressed by Jesus to the Father in the sad hour of farewell, imploring the grace of perpetual union of the disciples with one another, with Him and with the Father.

Not too much multiplicity! To give light to the adoration of Jesus and encourage it, nothing is better than to meditate Him and invoke Him in the threefold light of His Name, of His Heart and of His Blood.

That great and exceedingly popular saint of the 15th century in Italy, St. Bernardine of Siena, was the enthusiastic singer of

the Holy Name of Jesus, to which is dedicated a copious literature and an artistic glorification, distinguished by reflexes of thought and feeling which are sweet and inspiring.

After the revelations of Paray le Monial, the Sacred Heart took possession of all the pious souls of the time, apart from some badly advised contradiction now dispersed. The cult of the Sacred Heart triumphs in the hearts of men, in the temples and in the institutions which from it have taken their name and renown.

And the Blood! Oh, the most Precious Blood of Jesus which permits us to humbly ask of the Lord the pardon of our sins! It is recommended especially to us priests and faithful of the Diocese of Rome. Really, a glory most resplendent of the Roman clergy was that holy priest, born on the Esquiline a little before the French Revolution. It was he, namely, St. Gaspar del Bufalo, who was the true and great apostle of devotion to the Most Precious Blood of Jesus in the world. He was the founder of a Missionary Congregation which still lives and prospers under these auspices. And to the honour of St. Gaspar del Bufalo, a young priest of scarcely fifty when he died at Albano, go those words which he spoke to the most powerful man of his time who was wanting to impose on him an oath of fidelity: "I cannot, I ought not, I will not," and he preferred exile to cowardice.

Venerable Brethren and beloved sons—We have kept you longer listening to Our conversation to-day than on other days of the Synod, and, as we touched on various points, We find Ourselves, as We finish, standing on the summit of Calvary.

There stands before Our eyes the Name of Jesus over the head of the Crucified in three languages; the Heart of Jesus within His breast is palpitating in the anguish of His supreme sacrifice; the Blood of Jesus is pouring out from the open wound as from an inexhaustible fountain, bringing life and universal redemption. Two witnesses are standing beside the cross: the Mother of Jesus and the beloved disciple. O Mary, O Mary, thou knowest that we acclaim thee: "*Salus populi Romani*" and that the humble Bishop of Rome invokes thee every day as *Regina Apostolorum, Regina Cleri, Auxilium Christianorum, Auxilium Episcoporum*. These words suffice to tell the sweetness of Our love for thee, Mother of Jesus and our Mother. They suffice to confirm thy mercy towards us thy children, devout and good.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

W. LEONARD.

The Aboriginal Concept Of The Soul

Generations of philosophers and occasional statements of the doctrinal authority of the Catholic Church have shaped our concept of the human soul. But for all its precision and familiarity, its expression remains deeply involved in such meteorological and biological root-words as "air, wind, breeze, steam" or "breath, yawn and respiration." The greater our elucidation of the concept of the human soul, the more helpless we become in attempting to express its essence univocally. Non-religious literature is happy to take refuge in the terms "shade" and "shadow" (cf. Pluto, *rex umbrarum*), whereas we are prepared to localise the incomprehensible incorporeity of a "Holy Soul" in the realm of "darkness," and to speak even of the Supreme Spirit in a very anthropomorphic way.

Having become conscious of the clumsiness of our expression we find ourselves on the same level as that of the Australian aboriginal hunters and fruit collectors. They too have struggled, but in isolation, with the forming of philosophical ideas of their own and have tried to penetrate the mystery of their unseen life power. The veritable cauldron of ideas has not overflowed into the aboriginal philosophy from the vast ancient philosophical systems of Asian cultures. The result has been, with the Kimberley tribes of North-Western Australia at least, the development of a three-fold distinction in speaking of the entelechy of their macerated bodies. Approaching it from an empirical aspect they discern a three-fold state of soul according to the different stages of life, speaking of a transparent child-soul, of a powerful shadow-like body-soul and of an ethereal soul tenuously bound to the body, even after death.

From an analysis of these names we will try to grasp the structural and functional phenomenon of the Australian aboriginal soul-concept. Even if this attempt does not carry us much deeper into our own problems in psychology, it shows us the unquenchable urge of the *nosce te ipsum* and the common search for the Where-from and Where-to of existence, a yearning which God himself has inserted into the hearts of modern and primordial men alike. Out of this equal tendency neither of them can deny the basic unity of the human race.

I am founding this study on my own field research as well as

on that of some of my colleagues who worked in the neighbouring districts, so that the reports radiate from the Kimberley region, where the Pallottines started missionary work at the beginning of this century, towards Arnhem Land in the north-east, and into the Great Sandy Desert of Western Australia in the south-east.

I. THE SPIRIT-CHILD

Even before the beginning of pregnancy the future child appears to his father while he is dreaming or absorbed in thoughts and asks him whether he would accept it as his son or daughter. It appears to him as a small human figure with the same reddish skin as the new-born aboriginal. This reddish skin is significant, being the colour of their Supreme Beings and Culture Heroes. As soon as the father has given his consent the spirit-child will enter the mother. Then, once the father has thrown a light little spear or bullroarer with an engraved female figure against her hips, the mother will become conscious of her state. While women and children make no secret of their knowledge of the actual physiological facts of generation, where the male role in procreation has been given this mythological setting we can often observe an official denial of the need and of the effect of the paternal physiology. This mythological conception is emphasized after the secret initiation of the young men. A. Niedermeier remarked in his work on pastoral medicine: "The magic ideas of the co-operation of spirits with the formation of a new life immediately invading the womb, mean nothing else but an expression of the *per se* correct understanding that, apart from the *actus humanus*, a potency is at work excelling human power."¹

The natives of our Beagle Bay Mission believed that these spirit-children have been cumulatively created not by the Supreme Being but by secondary Spirit Beings who have a kind of eternal existence, totally independent of the Supreme Being. The latter keeps away from all earthly events in a sky world, inaccessible to any man or spirit, even by prayers or sacrifices. The spirit-children are awaiting their incarnation in the crown of certain eucalyptus-trees. They climb down from its branches and descend into subterranean water courses which they follow to a spring or waterhole—the usual residence of the mythological Rainbow Serpent, the symbol of fertility. Here the spirit-child waits for its future father, who will at some time rest near

¹A. Niedermeier, *Handbuch der speziellen Pastoralmedizin*; Vienna 1950, Vol. III, 99.

the spring or in the shade of a nearby tree and receive the vision of it.² The place is called *ni-arbi*, probably meaning "his appearance," i.e., the place of the appearance of the spirit-child. One day the father will withdraw there when a foreboding of his death has touched him.

In one of the North-Kimberley caves which I discovered in 1954, there was a painting of a large coiled snake full of eggs and a child riding on its neck. Egg-shaped stones polished by frequent use over many years were lying on a smooth stone table. The touching-up of the ochre colours and the rubbing of these stones were considered a fecundation of nature by the help of the Serpent. A picture of the "Tree of Life," from which the spirit-children descended, is sometimes painted besides it. A similar belief in the spirit-child and the "Tree of Life" has been found among the Samoyeds and Juktutes in Siberia as well as on the Highlands of Mongolia.³

In North-Australia the Thunder-Serpent stores children in their preconceived state in a dark cloud formed from its urine and the menses of earthly women. They fall down in raindrops which are said to be so small that only the ghost-seeing medicine-man can observe them. They will meet their fathers when he catches a fish or collects honey when their tiny vehicles have fallen into the sea or on the mainland.⁴

I found two significations for these spirit-children in Kimberley: *rai* and *randji*. The Aranda near Alice Springs name them *ratapa*⁵ All three words are the same linguistic origin as becomes easily visible by the following two lines of derivation:

ra-i from *ra-dja* from *ra-djaba* (*ra-tapa*)

ran from *ran-dji* from *ran-djibi*.

The root meaning of *rai*, etc., is nothing but "homo," which has been applied to "child, father" by some Kimberley tribes and even by the Narrinyeri at the mouth of the Murray River. Tribes in Northern Territory and South Australia have used it for the formation of names for tribes. But usually the archaic forms *rai*, *ratapa* have been reserved for "spirit-child" while roots such as *bab-*, *mob-*, *wob-*, *mam-*, *wal-*, *war-*, *gadj-*, etc.,

²E. A. Worms, *Mythologische Selbstbiographie eines australischen Ureinwohners*. In: *Wiener Voelkerkundliche Mitteilungen*, University of Vienna, 1957, V, 40-48.

³H. Nachtigall, *Die erhoehte Bestattung in Nord- & Hochasien*. In: *Anthropos*, Fribourg, 1953, Vol. 48, 44-70.

⁴C. P. Mountford, *Arnhem Land: Art, Myth & Symbolism*. Melbourne, 1956, 308ss.

⁵T. G. H. Strehlow, *Aranda Traditions*. Melbourne, 1947, 118.

have been employed for "children" in every-day language. Furthermore, the root *rai* has found extensive use in the forming of terms for taboo-obligations, for ritual implements as bull-roarers, phallocrypts, subincision as well as for the rites themselves, according as all of them have come in one or the other way in contact with the spirit world. The fundamental meaning of *rai*-, *ran*- "human being" has been lifted by the nomadic tribes of the Great Sandy Desert and of the north-west coast into the mythological sphere by its application to the pre-existing "spirit-child" apprehended in a mystical contact by the father. In a similar way the tribes of East-Arnhem Land have used the form *ranga* for many cult-implements which emphasise fertility.⁶ Its occasional extension to the soul of an adult and to the soul of the dead gives us a valuable indication of a belief in one personal principle outlasting all periods of human life.

II. THE SOUL OF THE BODY

It is a peculiarity of the aboriginal psychology to suppose that man possesses besides his real bodily form of existence another of a more ethereal, transparent character. The latter is experienced by the natives during the state of dreaming, of intellectual concentration and deliberation, artistic intuition, imagination and telemagic ceremonies and of strong emotions. This hazy acceptance of a psychic dualism seems to express their presentiment of a spiritual principle not absolutely dependent on matter. The Australian natives are far from being materialists, even if their untrained minds have not reached a pure concept of soul. They find the independence of their somatic soul in some way confirmed by its ability to leave the slumbering body and to wander about.

They are convinced that a man would be badly hurt and delivered to sickness and mental derangement if he were to be suddenly awakened, because his vagrant soul would not have sufficient time to return to its earth-bound body.

There is another possibility of great danger and misfortune, namely when a bad spirit who lies in wait would carry the soul of a sleeping native away to the realm of the dead. Some years ago the members of the Yaoro tribe near Broome showed me the "Dog-Stone," a quartzite-boulder with many round holes into which the malignant Djawari-gabo, lit. "The Eater of the Dead,"

⁶A. P. Elkin, *The Australian Aborigines*. 3rd ed., Sydney, 1954, 217.

hides the souls of sleeping men which he had caught during their dream-walkings.⁷ They recognize their souls are missing when, on awakening, they observe a certain swelling of their bodies. Unless they possess the favour of a medicine-man who is able to discover the prison of their souls and restore them to their bodies, their health will fail completely. Illness and death are therefore not considered as pathological events but as the effects of negative-mythological complications, with all kinds of social repercussions—enmities, magic ordeals and declarations of taboos ensuing. This attitude explains the refusal of, or lack of confidence which our desert-mission tribes as the Gogadja and Bidungo exhibit towards prophylactic or therapeutic treatment. I found, for instance, sulphonamide tablets untouched in the clenched hands of dead natives treated by the missionaries. A wise rooting out of an ancient false religion can therefore help in paving the road for the “adaptation” of the culture of an old people imperilled by the contagious diseases unavoidably accompanying the inroad of the white man.

But a dream-voyage can have its good effects as the native can receive, according to their opinion, poetic, choreographic, musical and pictographic inspiration on such occasions. Great inventions as that of fire-making, of the construction of big stone walls for trapping of fish—already observed by William Dampier, the Buccaneer, along the north-west coast, in 1688—are considered a result of a special concourse with the culture—or ancestor—spirits. The artist carries the halo of his special relation with the spirit world and is marked out by distinguishing titles as “the wise,” “the knower,” “the expert,” words which are often connected linguistically with the preternatural beings. Once I was allowed to observe a rite of a rather cataleptic appearance, called *wananinj* which could be translated by “apprehension, rapture” or “spirit-contact.” Initiated men crouched on both sides of a cord covered with feather-down and tied to the tops of five big bullroarers or *tjurunga* driven into the sand. A small bass-figure of *Djanba*, the mythological lawgiver, was erected at its left side having two pointing sticks (*wadangara*), instruments for the projection of fearful conjurations, in its front. The men with the desire of visiting a certain country some forty miles away grasped the string with one hand. After about twenty minutes they stated they had been absent and their *biljur* or

⁷E. A. Worms, *Aboriginal Place Names in Kimberley, W.A.* In: *Oceania*, Sydney, 1944, XIV, 299.

soul had been carried to this place. The whole arrangement involved the accumulation of the most powerful religious implements the natives could think of, with the intention of evoking a kind of bilocation, by a concentrated application of the power of spirits. But when I interjected, perhaps too rashly, that I had seen them before me all this time, they became disappointed answering: "You must not say such a thing."⁸

The main names for "body-soul" in the tribal languages of the Kimberleys are *djalngga*, *nimangar* or *nimaradja*. The former emphasizes rather the physical power of life, while the latter is used for its extra-corporal ethereal existence. The Pallottine Fathers have applied this term for "soul" and for the "Holy Ghost" in their catechetical instructions. The general root-meaning of *djal* seems to be "flesh," "vigorous body" thus as the corporal entelechy. It can be found in many parts of Australia in words for "men, people, tribe, power (physical, intellectual, occult)" as well as for relationship—and taboo terminology. *Djal* has been used in the specific term for the profession of medicine-men, namely, in *djalng-guru*, lit., "craft-carriers," men with an extraordinary preternatural power which they are said to have received through an intimate intercourse with the spirits. The words *nimangar* or *nimaradja*, lit., "his darkness, his shadow," has been extended to the human image reflected on the surface of water, in a mirror and even in a photograph, and finally to "ghost, spirit." As such we find the former in *Manga-gundja-gundja*, the Creator Being, lit., "Dark-Man-Man," "The Shadow Being," or "The Spirit" (S.E. Kimberley) and in *mang-gara*,⁹ the famous "disappearing-sandals" (sometimes *gadidja*). The ritual murderer wears them in his revenge action giving him invisibility, the quality of a ghost or soul. Incidentally, we can discover their counterpart in North-Germanic folklore, namely the legendary vanishing shoes, in Germ. "Tarn-schuhe," from Germ. *tarnen*, Old Engl. *dernan*, Mod. Engl. *darn*, "to hide." This parallel is not introduced to suggest that the two are created by cultural exchange. Rather it illustrates the basically similar way human minds work the world over even when considering the preternatural.

⁸E. A. Worms, *Gorangara-Feier im australischen Kimberley*. In: *Annali Lateranensi*, Citta del Vaticano, 1942, VI, 224, 234-235.

⁹H. Nekes and E. A. Worms, *Australian Languages*, Fribourg, 1953, III, 371.

III. THE SOUL OF THE DEAD

The native idea of a material-ethereal unity of the body with its psychic principle becomes evident in the belief of the aborigines in a somatic-spiritual existence of the body after death. His entity will not be destroyed by death at once, but is subjected to a final metamorphosis. Among some tribes in North Kimberley the person of the dead will slip into another noun-class¹⁰ and receive another signification, namely, *biljur*. We may find it strange to learn that the soul of the deceased will keep a loose connection with its mortal frame until the second burial at least. But this attitude of a "living corpse" is a very old one which can be observed not only in the funeral customs of the Andaman Islands, in Mexico, Colombia and Egypt but in the palaeolithic interment of the Mousterian culture 50-80,000 years ago."¹¹

The soul of the dead will enter the distant realm of the dead only when all mourning and burial obligations have been scrupulously fulfilled and when the body has been ritually destroyed even to its bones. The circumstances of this procedure will give us a deeper insight into the essence of *biljur*. Already at the beginning of the agony (that is, when the body-soul *nimandjara* goes out to the sick body and delays its return for longer intervals), the camp people react by a silence wrought by fear and low mourning. It will change over to a perturbing commotion when breathing ceases and the body grows cold announcing that the migrating soul has been finally kept back by the spirits. The men who before had kept a dead silence with their head pressed against the trees, now begin to throw boomerangs and spears at the invisible ghosts and their human tool, the ritual murderer. The women hammer their heads with sharp digging sticks and stones until blood runs down their faces. The bush resounds with their wailing in which the howling of the kangaroo-dogs is mixed. But all this is not only the expression of the pain of separation but the dutiful protestation of their personal innocence regarding this death, for which revenge may be taken by the deceased or his relatives since each "murder" is considered as being caused by harmful ritual interference.

Biljur, the "soul" of the dead, will remain near the corpse with a terrifying attachment. Switching noises, the cries of the curlews and the barking of dogs scenting him betray his roaming

¹⁰A. Capell, *Mythology in Northern Kimberley*. In: *Oceania*, 1939, IX, 385.

¹¹J. Maringer, *Vorgeschichtliche Religion*, Zurich, 1952, 118.

about. Some natives think they can see him. Sometimes they will leave their protective wind-breaks to make a small fire or put a shell with water outside the camp so that the *biljur* can refresh himself without entering their abode. They will also apply drastic means to keep away the uncanny visitor, e.g., the ethnologically famous corpse-fettering which was known also in the palaeolithic era. The dead body is rubbed with fat and ochre, the nails of the fingers and toes as well as the body-hair singed, the thumbs and index fingers tied together and the hands crossed over the chest and perforated by a thorn. It will be bound with a fibre-cord in a squatting position and then wrapped in broad bark-sheets of the paperbark tree (*Melaleuca*). The parcelled body is laid on a platform built in the branches of a tree or on a scaffold resting on posts. "*Gar-buga-djana djibi wirdji-binja*," said a Garadjari-man, south of Broome, which means lit., "Bone-tree-upon man wrapping-put I"="I put the dead man in tree of bones." In Kimberley the platform sometimes has the form of a rectangle, near Brisbane and at the mouth of the Murray River that of a triangle which probably signifies the raft carrying the "soul" to the island of the dead.¹² This high-bier is erected out of practical, ceremonial and mythological reasons: to keep the hungry dingoes away, to accelerate the mummification for an early burial, to settle the body close to the Ancestor Spirits who are supposed to live in the crowns of the trees and to recall the early abode of *rai*, the Spirit-Child, which began its earthly existence by descending from the sacred *Bandara*-Tree, the Tree of Life. In other parts of Australia where the interment is custom, the fettered body is laid in a grave-niche, the face turned towards the island of the dead.

Branches and bark keep the pressure of the soil away from the body. A narrow entrance for the *biljur* is kept open which reminds us of the similar arrangement in the locking-stone of the dolmen or cromlech of the younger megalithic culture of the mediterranean area, perhaps 2500 B.C.¹³ There are regions in North Australia where parts of the corpse such as blood, hair or smaller bones are carried around the neck or in the mouth guaranteeing the person the company of the benevolent spirit of the dead. Where—as in East Arnhem Land and Lake Eyre District—small pieces of the decayed flesh or fat are eaten: we

¹²Tom Petrie's *Reminiscences*, Sydney, 1932, 31.

R. M. Berndt and T. H. Johnston, *Death and Burial in Ooldea*, In: *Oceania*, 1942, XII, 205.

¹³J. Maringer, l.c., 268.

are not witnessing cannibalism but only qualified burial ceremonies assuring the bereaved a favourable contact with the deceased.¹⁴ But it is only after the "Secondary Burial," the completion of all ritual obligations, that the roaming *biljur* will be quiescent. Being now totally banished from all social touch with the tribe the people begin adjusting themselves to the loss and return to the daily routine. For this final burial the bones of the dead who had been exposed upon the platform for several months are broken and hidden in termite hills or rock shelters. In 1954 I found such a burial place in a walled up fissure of a cave in North Kimberley the ceiling of which was covered by the large figure of Ungur, the keeper of the well of the Spirit-Children, and the principle of fertility in general. A few miles further on I discovered in another cave a trough with two collar-bones of a man. These had been faithfully carried by his widow until she died and was cremated in a shelter nearby. Over this enclosure a gallery of human rock paintings faint in colour were looking down on her melancholic relics. In East Arnhem Land the cleaned and ochred bones are carried by women for years and then placed in a log-coffin—a hollow log perhaps 12 feet long, covered with complicated mythological designs.¹⁵ It is put in the ground upside down. Soon termites will have gnawed away this elaborated monument, and the bones will lay scattered on the sandy surface without further regard. Some desert tribes cut the hair of the dead and span it over a wooden cross, called "thread-cross" known all over the western half of our continent as *wanga* or *wanga-rara*. The natives living along the Trans-continental Railway in S.A. throw it into a waterhole where it is swallowed by the mythological Serpent, the Lord of the realm of the departed.¹⁶ In our Beagle Bay Mission, near Broome, W.A., the natives carry this rather expressionistic representation of the dead as masks or over their heads on long shafts during their evening-corroborees.

As far as I could observe, the natives of the north-west do not possess a special term for our "dying" or "death." Such alternative words as "to fall, being tired, weak, sick" or "becoming cold" are not euphemistic expressions but an indication of their belief in death as a mythological, rather than a physical event.

¹⁴W. S. Chaseling, *Yulengor*. London, 1957, 118, 167.

S. Gason, *The Dieyerie Tribe*. In: E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, Melbourne, 1886, Vol. II, 63.

¹⁵C. P. Mountford, *l.c.*, 313.

¹⁶Berndt and Johnston, *l.c.*, 205.

Perhaps the Gothic *af-daujan*, "being exhausted" and the Old-Germanic root *daw* in *tuwan*, *dojan*, "to die," "death" indicate a parallel attitude. The native word *biljur* for the "soul" of the dead, is used for "white man, half-caste, white spots of the skin, new-born child." Its root-meaning is simply "whitish, pale" expressing the general Australian comprehension of the white colour of the dead and his ghost as well as that of the white man who was considered as an arrival from the land of the dead. We find the same mythological and linguistic attitude in Tasmania.¹⁷ We meet an equivalent in N.S.W. too where *guba* (Deniliquin), *numa-gon* (Jervis Bay), *guin* (Pt. Stephen) and *wanda* (Bathurst) means "white man" and "ghost."¹⁸ Although the root-meanings of these words are not "white" but "man, being, person" their reciprocity shows that here too the European was considered as a ghost-like being. Some half-castes of N.S.W. still refer colloquially to the white man by these terms. The original meaning however is lost. We are no longer ghosts to them!

IV. THE REALM OF THE DEAD

We find the belief in a realm of the dead in most parts of Australia. The following are the characteristics most generally found: a very distant island, usually situated in the ocean, a raft or canoe for the voyage of the departed with a spirit-ferryman reminding us of the classical Charon across the Styx of Hades, a presiding powerful spirit often Rainbow Serpent (always pregnant), a carefree existence with the fulfilment of all earthly necessities, a life of a limited duration and—at least in Central Australia—a catastrophical destruction of the deceased without resurrection. Some tribes are said to have a certain inkling of the possibility of re-incarnation¹⁹ or of a kind of everlasting life, but I never met such an outlook. I fear that the abstractness of eternity does not correspond to the native mind and that we cannot dare to enlarge their expression for "a long time" to the idea of an interminable and immutable existence. But it is a fact that when the West-Kimberley natives employ their own words for "always" they often use such terms as *manga-dja*, *manga-rigara* or *mandja-ngal* which seem to be connected with the same root as that for the ethereal body-soul, mentioned in Section II.

¹⁷E. A. Worms, *Tasmanian Mythological Terms*. In: *Anthropos*, 1959, Vol. 54.

¹⁸E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, Melbourne, 1887, Vol. III, 396, 422, 378.

¹⁹A. P. Elkin, *l.c.*, 48, 144.

These words for "always" often mean a kind of uncertain, nebulous extension which for the aborigines is an attribute of the preternatural spirits. It is applied also for the indefinite past and future of the earth itself.

1. The coastal tribes of North-West Kimberley, which have been christianized by the Pallottines, up till now, call the island of the dead *Luman*. It is situated towards the west in the Indian Ocean and a cool place where old friends meet and hunt for an undefined time. The root *lum-* is found in *Lum*, the Bringer of the fire, in *Lu* or *Lumagu*, the Rainbow Serpent, and in *Lumindjin*, the Maker of the first boomerang, always underlining a spiritual character.

2. *Djiligun*, the island of the shadows of the Ungarinjen in East Kimberley, again is placed in the west. The departed of the neighbouring Gwini meet in the afterworld *Bundilmiri*, the Lord of the Dead, who presents them to his father "*Wolaro*, the creator of all things, who, however, is not in any sense to be spoken of as a god."²⁰ "*Waloro*" is the "black snake" for the Djaro, further south. It is interesting to note that this mythological figure *Bundul-miri* of the Gwini emerges in far away Victoria (Grampians, Melbourne, Gippsland) under the same name *Bundjil*, the Sky Being, the ancestor of men, the guardian of the initiation ceremonies, who was before a man himself, but is called "Our Father" (*Mami ngada*) by the initiated Kurnai (Gippsland),²¹ just as a similar being *Baiama* by many tribes of N.S.W. I have sufficient reason to maintain that both names, *bundjil* and *baiama*, have the original meaning of "human being," and that their high-monotheistic position has been seemingly over-emphasized by some anthropologists and by some Catholic authors of books on comparative religion.

3. The souls of the Narindjeri, at the mouth of the Murray, travel on a triangular raft (perhaps introduced from Queensland) to Kangaroo Island at the entrance of Spencer Gulf which they call *Nguru Ngaua*, lit., the land of the ghosts. The raft is called *ngaratta*, perhaps "corpse-with." Before it "was placed over a slow fire till the skin rose, and then it was all peeled off, and the corpse appeared a White Man, the pigmentum nigrum having

²⁰A. Capell, l.c., 386.

²¹A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, London, 1904, 491 ss., 502.

been removed with the scarf skin. Then it was painted with grease and ochre and called *grinkari*, a name applied to Europeans by the Blacks, because they think that they resemble a peeled corpse."²²

4. In East-Arnhem Land the spirit ferryman who himself was the first man to die, rows the dead in a bark-canoe *Lambu*, lit., paperbark, to an easterly island named *Puralko*, or better *Buralgor*, taking his bearings from the morning star *Barnumbir* and accompanied by dolphins. The star as well as the fish are spirits. Every morning the Morning Star, the Lord of the Dead, rises from the womb of the Earth Mother, and towards evening is drawn back into the darkness of the realm of the dead, being always connected by the umbilical cord to his mother. At the landing place other souls of the dead who had arrived previously will cover the newcomer with a shower of spears without destroying him before they will accept him into their circle. They pass their time by singing, dancing and fishing. The spirits of women rejuvenate and bear children after a short pregnancy and without labour. Bad characters are changed into acceptable ones before their coming to the island, and the aged and sick recover before arrival on the island. It is a pity that we have no information about the duration of this life.²³

5. The most tragic and hopeless of all Australian ideas of the life hereafter seem to prevail among the nomads of the Western Desert where the Pallottines are working on its northern fringe among the Gogadja, called Loritja by the Aranda of Central Australia according to C. Strehlow. They give the island of the dead situated in the distant northern seas, the appropriate name of *Djuwara-gu Ngura* "the Land of the Dead." Here all living nature: the birds, trees, animals and men are of a white colour, indicated by the word *biljur*, the term for the soul of the dead, as we saw above. Life here is similar to their old earthly life. But one day, when the soul has taken refuge under a white eucalyptus during a heavy rain, it is struck by lightning. It is slain and pulverized, its remains are washed by the flood under the roots of the tree of death. Its existence has ceased, it is annihilated.²⁴

²²G. Taplin in E. M. Curr, l.c., II, 243, 248, 273.

²³C. P. Mountford, l.c., 325 ss.

²⁴C. Strehlow, *Die Aranda-und Loritja-Staemme in Zentral-Australien*. Frankfurt a.M., 1908, Vol. II, 6-7.

This pessimistic report has not been exaggerated; it was recently confirmed by T. G. H. Strehlow, lecturer at the Adelaide University: "The Northern Aranda man has no illusions about death as far as the human individual is concerned: death is, to him, the last great catastrophe which leads to the eventual complete destruction of his own body and of his own spirit. His life's work is done, the ancestor merely went to sleep; but man must die, and his death ends all."²⁵

These happenings would have taken a quite different course if the mythical curlew-man had not been killed for a second time by the magpie-man and trampled into the earth. An informant told Strehlow jr.: "And now all of us die and are annihilated for ever, and there is no resurrection for us." He had heard the message of *kamerintja* or the Resurrection from the first Lutheran missionaries at Hermannsburg in 1877, but had not accepted it.²⁶ "We all travel to the bones," as an old native near Melbourne expressed himself according to Howitt.

On the other hand we find Australian tribes with myths which at the first sight seem not to teach such an absolute destruction of personal existence. According to the Narindjeri (Murray Rv.) the sons of the mythological Moon-man throw ropes down from the sky up which the deceased can climb.²⁷ In my ethnological collection at our house at Kew a piece of wood is exhibited, covered with numerous esoteric spirals. It was given to me by the old men of the Njol Njol tribe at Beagle Bay Mission in 1934. The men explained that it was the last piece of a tree on which the natives could climb up to the sky. But it had unfortunately been felled by women collecting firewood. Two similar stories come from the Aranda (Central Australia) where the "Men with poisonous glands" climbed up to the sky with the help of their long spears. When these were taken away they addressed the people on earth: "We remain immortal for ever." Then they changed themselves into the Magellan Clouds of the southern horizon.²⁸ A second myth mentions a revenge party which cut down the giant casuarina tree and so interrupted the

²⁵T. G. H. Strehlow, *l.c.*, 43.

²⁶T. G. H. Strehlow, *l.c.*, 43-45.

²⁷R. M. Berndt, *Aspects of Jaralde Culture, South Australia*, In: *Oceania*, 1940, XI, 169.

²⁸C. Strehlow, *l.c.*, Vol. I, 21-24.

previous traffic between the sky and the earth.²⁹ These reports contrast the happier fate of the immortal hero and ancestor spirits with that of the less fortunate earth-bound human race whose mortal *biljur* are detained on the island of the shadows until final dissolution and oblivion. This present destiny seems not to have been the original state, but the result of unexpected and unhappy events.

V. CONCLUSION

Let me conclude with a summary of this article and the addition of a wider observation.

1. The aboriginal concept of a psychic principle with a vague kind of spirituality is Australia-wide. However, this concept generally considers that a body-substance always adheres to the soul. Even in death the soul is not completely free from this spectral body.

Whereas native vocabularies give sufficient proof of their abstractive ability of mind, their rare need of using abstractions and the slight vocabulary of these terms have contributed to this lack of precision. Also the isolation from intellectual movements of the neighbouring Asia and their consequent development "in vacuo" has produced this maimed concept of the soul which does not coincide with our philosophical definitions at all.

2. The tragic curtailment of natural happiness in the realm of the dead, a simple consequence of the above faulty premise, only mirrors his human lot. But its positive content seems to represent a touching memory of an earlier belief—a belief in a more permanent existence in a better world after this rough life of earthly walkabouts.

3. Australian religion usually denies an immediate casual connection between creatures and their so-called supreme being who lives an isolated and otiose life beyond the stars. Between this being and men certain ancestor spirits and pairs of culture-heroes are insinuated but they too are independent of the supreme being. This lack of dependence of the lower spirits and of men on the supreme being poses the important questions: in

²⁹T. G. H. Strehlow. In: *MS. of Songs of Central Australia*, to be published by Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1960.

this context, isn't their supreme being superfluous? Can their supreme being be called supreme? When and under what influence has the supreme being been pushed so far aside?

4. Because their supreme being is so remote, the aborigines have a strong and exclusive leaning towards many secondary beings—these we often call ancestor spirits or culture heroes. Their belief is that they participate in the timeless and continual creative activity of the spirit beings by a supra-natural union with them and that in this way they can influence all earthly events: the biological fertility of men, animals and plants, intellectual and social achievements, the good and bad health of friend or foe, etc. This mythical union is not caused by sacrifices or prayers when these forms are used in the exact sense in which we understand them.

The causal process is usually and unsuitably referred to in anthropological literature as "dreaming." We have no universal term in our vocabulary for this psychic process but it is more complex than the term "dreaming" suggests.

The native will produce this union by his own intense wishing for it and by complicated ceremonies meticulously observed ~~which both express and instigate~~ this union. These ceremonies often involve the ritual use of sacred and secret implements (*tjurunga*) left behind by these creator-spirits when, in the form of men or animals, they wandered over the still unfinished earth shaping it.

The effect produced is comparable to a preternatural mysticism in which the native considers himself united with his culture-heroes when both manipulate the powers of nature. These excursions are not limited by time; for the range of this contact reaches as easily back into the mythological pre-ages as into their personal life, present and future, carried by an ideology of mythical simultaneity or 'timelessness,' which is known to us from Hellenistic mythology.

We have seen in the Australian religion a certain quasi-sacramental notion revolving around the *tjurunga* and, as it were, "the continuing mysteries" of their mythology. But the fundamental difference between the Christian and aboriginal religion lies in the fact that our mysteries are grounded in

historical events whereas the natives have only the products of their time honoured imagination.³⁰

ERNEST A. WORMS, S.A.C.

Pallottine College, Manly.

³⁰While this article was already in the printers' hands a rather sensational discussion about the probable sacrificial character operating in the Karwadi (Mother of All)-initiations of the tribes in the north-western parts of the Northern Territory was published by W. E. H. Stanner, "On Aboriginal Religion," in *Oceania*, Sydney, 1959, Vol. III, 108-127. It contains such a striking comparison with the partitions of the Sacrifice of Mass: "Participation—Consecration—Immolation—Destruction—Transformation—Return," that it presents a challenge to the theologian and to the student of comparative religion.

SHORT NOTICE

THE CHALLENGE OF THE RETARDED CHILD, by Sister M. Theodore, O.S.F. (U.S.A. Bruce Publishing Co., 1959. 199 pp., 3.95 dollars.)

On one page in this interesting, informative book there is a remark by Cardinal Cushing to the effect that the greatness of a civilisation can be measured by the provision it makes for its ~~least members~~. It is encouraging for us to remember this when we feel the impact on our age of neo-paganism. In spite of paganizing influences the past 10 years have shown an expansion of interest in the mentally retarded and their personal welfare. A retarded child is no longer looked on as a shameful figure in a family and we are glad to read the words of the sympathetic and experienced teacher in this book: "Although many of these children are so limited that others must take responsibility for them all through life, they help in their own way to make the world a better place. These children serve as a sensitive sounding-board for the society in which they live."

Sister Theodore has spent over 50 years in training mentally retarded children, having offered herself in their service when she was a young nun. Obscurely it was a gesture of thanksgiving for being one of a healthy family of 14. While teaching in an ordinary grade school, as a Franciscan nun, she saw the work her Order was doing with a handful of retarded children at the St. Soletta School in Jefferson, Wisconsin. At that time the care given to retarded children was mainly custodial, education being considered out of the question. To-day this school has "an enviable national reputation" as an educational establishment. The author writes not only of the work of this school, but of the whole problem of the sub-normal child. Her exposition of the subject is practical and sympathetic, made, one would say, chiefly to the parents of similar children. Happy are those parents if they come across this book, for Sister Theodore could not fail to comfort them in their anxiety.

M.O.

Bishop James Quinn :

From Dublin To Brisbane¹

Dr. Quinn, now two years ordained, returned to Ireland in the year of revolutions, 1848. In Rome, Pius IX fled from revolutionaries, who declared a short-lived republic. In France, Louis Philippe abdicated and Louis Napoleon became President of a Second Republic. Austria, Hungary and Prussia were in political turmoil. But Ireland was politically, socially and economically the most distressful country.

Back in Dublin, James Quinn rested at Blackrock with friends of his brother, Andrew. The local parish priest, Dr. Ennis, gave him occasional duties to perform. We must mention some of the national troubles which affected his ministry and also the future of Queensland.

The movement to obtain by constitutional means the repeal of the union with England had failed and its leader, O'Connell, had died in 1847. In 1848 an attempt to achieve independence by less pacific means ended with the sentencing of the Young Ireland leaders to death and then commuting the sentences to transportation to Van Diemen's Land.

Now the great famine which began in 1846 brought, in the wake of starvation, fever, dysentery and the dread scourge of cholera. The number of deaths and of mass emigrations to America now seems almost unreal. Historians affirm that the population which in 1845 had been 8,300,000 fell to less than 6,600,000 in 1851.

These terrible conditions gave Quinn his ministerial baptism of fire. His zeal in attending the sick and comforting and advising the distraught people won the admiration of Dr. Ennis, who predicted great things for him.

One of the problems that confronted Catholics in Ireland was that of finding higher education which they could conscientiously accept. The Queen's Colleges were a matter of some contention among the bishops, but the Plenary Synod of Thurles in 1850 carried a decree condemning the Colleges and resolving to establish a Catholic University. This was the policy of the Holy See and the Apostolic Delegate, Dr. Cullen.

¹This is the third and last of a series of articles written on the occasion of the centenary of the State of Queensland.

Scarcely had the Synod ended when, in November, 1850, a Catholic secondary school for boys was begun, bearing the name of St. Laurence O'Toole, patron of the Archdiocese. Although it was in Dublin, it is very doubtful if the local Archbishop, Dr. Murray, was in any sense its author. Dr. Murray had favoured a *modus agendi* with the Queen's Colleges (he was offered a seat in the Privy Council, too) and the indications are that the new College owed its existence to the Archbishop of Armagh and Apostolic Delegate, Dr. Cullen.

The Rector of St. Laurence's was Cullen's star pupil, James Quinn. Moreover, it was founded with funds left by his uncle, Monsignor Doyle. This is learnt from an obituary leading article, written by Dr. Matthew Quinn, or with his approval, in the Bathurst "Record" of September 1, 1881. The article states: "His late uncle, Monsignor Doyle, had left a large legacy, which he willed should be devoted to the promotion of Catholic education. In obedience to this direction of the testator, Dr. O'Quinn founded a great Catholic High School known as St. Laurence O'Toole's Seminary, Harcourt Street, Dublin." (The article goes on to say that Dr. Quinn also purchased an estate in Wicklow to endow schools in Dublin and that this endowment was one of the chief supports of Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, founded by Cardinal Cullen.)

The school premises in Harcourt Street at No. 16 still exist, and they look nothing like the school buildings to which we are accustomed. The house is one of those Georgian mansions which contribute much to the charm of the Irish capital. A few steps above the street level is the main floor (there are five floors in all) with two spacious rooms in front, each with a large window and an elegant fire-place. A grand staircase gives access to the upper floors. In 1950 this historic house, or at least the main floor of it, was occupied by distributors of a well-known make of vacuum cleaner, who knew nothing of Quinn, or of another famous occupant, J. H. Newman.

Quinn's College having been successfully launched, Dr. Cullen, still in Armagh, invited John Henry Newman to accept the rectorship of the proposed university. Cullen had met Newman in Rome in 1847, when he examined some theses for the convert of two years standing. Quinn became acquainted with Newman at the same time.

In 1852 Newman went to Dublin to deliver the lectures on

University Education, now regarded as a classic. In a letter to a friend he describes how he met Quinn and the sequel. "At Black-rock, where I said Mass on Saturday morning after the perils of the deep, I found the chaplain was Dr. Quinn, whom I had known at the Irish College in Rome. I took him up to 'town,' and he showed me over a most splendid house (once Lord Clare's), in Harcourt Street, which he has turned into a boarding and day school. It struck me it would be a very good abode for me permanently, paying rent for a room, and Dr. Quinn came into the idea at once. There is a chapel and meals (unless the mutton is too tough) in the house. He has offered me a beautiful room with a chandelier and (perhaps) pagan alto-relievos on the walls, unfurnished."²

The sequel was that when Newman returned to Ireland to take up the work of the new University he stayed with Quinn until October, 1854, when he rented a house for himself at No. 6 Harcourt Street. In a letter to a friend he complained of the food Dr. Quinn was serving him—but Newman was prone to complain.

In 1853 Quinn had 70 pupils, 27 of whom were boarders. Some of the senior ones entered their names in the University, and the College now became a University Collegiate House and Dr. Quinn its Dean.

By 1856 relations between Quinn and Newman appear to have become strained. The latter wrote to Ambrose St. John: "I have been saying Mass in the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament in the University Church. . . . The accident that led to my saying Mass there was thus: Dr. Quinn struck at the beginning of the term, and says he can't obey our statutes, and is (professedly) withdrawing his youths. Whether on purpose or not, he wrote to me last night to say that he could not provide a celebrant to-day (it looks like a gun to bring me to:), etc."³

When Newman was deeply dissatisfied because the bishops wanted to choose his Vice-Rector, they proposed as a "middle plan" four eligible clerics, one of whom was Quinn, on the condition that his health permitted. The professors favoured Quinn, but he was temporarily absent. Just as well, for the Newman-Quinn combination would not have worked, unless perhaps the roles were reversed and Quinn was in charge.

²*Newman's University: Idea and Reality*, by Fergal McGrath, S.J., p. 157.

³McGrath, p. 417.

Newman resigned office in November, 1858, and ceased to act then, although the bishops did not accept the resignation until August, 1859. In the meantime Dr. Quinn had been appointed bishop.

Dr. Polding's request for the erection of a new diocese in the proposed State of Queensland was presented to the Holy See by Dr. Goold in 1858, but after consulting Archbishop Cullen he recommended not Dr. Polding's nominee but James Quinn. The result was a foregone conclusion, and on April 14, 1859, Quinn was appointed.⁴ The Bull was conveyed to Dublin by the Bishop of Melbourne and handed to the first Bishop of Brisbane on May 24.

The consecration took place on June 29, 1859, in the University Church, Stephen's Green, which Newman left as a lasting monument and which he thought the most perfect, to his taste, "in the three kingdoms." Cardinal Moran affirms that Archbishop Cullen was absent through indisposition and that the Archbishop of Armagh, Dr. Dixon, was consecrating prelate. Another account says it was Dr. Cullen, but Cardinal Moran is more likely to be right, and may well have been present at the ceremony.

Evidence of the new bishop's vision was that he immediately conceived a plan to bring migrants to his sparsely populated diocese. By 1861 there were only 30,059 souls in the whole new State (and males exceeded females by about 7000). On his proposed scheme he consulted one who had spent five years in Australia, though not of his free choice, Dr. Kevin O'Doherty.⁵ Dr. O'Doherty was one of those transported to Tasmania on the charge of supporting the insurrection of 1848. He now agreed to go to Brisbane and help to promote the immigration scheme, and this he actually did. He became a member of the Legislative Assembly, and remained a devout member of the bishop's flock, his personal friend and medical adviser until the bishop's death in 1881. In fact, he issued the death certificate.

For over eight years Quinn had been a schoolmaster, and a

⁴The Bathurst "Record" of September 1, 1881, states: "The late Archbishop of Dublin, Cardinal Cullen, who was . . . fully aware of the talents and energy of Dr. O'Quinn, recommended his appointment as the first Bishop of the newly-erected See of Brisbane. His recommendation was carried into effect" (p. 389).

⁵See Article, Kevin Izod O'Doherty in Australia, by Father R. Wynne, in *A.C. Record*, January, 1950, p. 22.

very successful one. Cardinal Moran mentions that when the bishop visited Ireland in 1871 he met at a reunion 120 of his old Harcourt Street students—priests, doctors, lawyers, military and naval officers, merchants, etc.⁶

It was a fortunate circumstance that Bishop Quinn had been confessor to the Sisters of Mercy in Baggot Street, and further proof of his good judgment that he got a party of the good Sisters, who were already devoted to education, to accompany him to the antipodes. Their contribution to education and to works of mercy in Queensland since 1861 is too well known to need comment.

THE VOYAGE OUT

For a brief account of the bishop's voyage to Brisbane, we draw on the chronicle of the Sisters who accompanied him, which is still preserved.

On December 3, 1860, six Sisters, with Mother M. Vincent Whitty in charge, sailed from North Wall, Dublin, to Liverpool to join the bishop and the priests he had gathered since his consecration to become his missionaries. They all boarded the sailing vessel, "Donald McKay," on the morning of December 5, but she did not get under way until December 8. The priests were Dr. John Cani, Father Michael Renehan, Father Fulgentius Hodebourg, Father Paul Tissot and Father Cusse.

A Sister from an English convent joined the band from Dublin. She was a skilled needlewoman and the bishop "ordered" her to make him a mitre. One of the passengers, a widow, gave His Lordship three diamonds to put on the mitre, and this literally precious mitre was used by him for long afterwards. Daily Mass, the sacraments and ceremonies were held in full measure during the leisurely journey. The voyage was prosperous except for some becalming near the Equator.

On March 12, 1861, "Donald McKay" arrived outside Port Philip Heads. To the astonishment of the travellers, boisterous seas did not prevent two Sisters coming out in an open boat in company with the Customs officials to greet the new arrivals. Because of suspected cases of small-pox on board, priests and Sisters were detained in quarantine on shore near the heads, although Dr. Cani was allowed to move about in the neighbouring country and say Mass there. The bishop seems to have gone on ahead.

⁶*Hist. of C.C. in Aust.*, p. 602.

The coastal steamer "Yarra" took the party to Sydney, where they re-embarked on the "Wonga Wonga" for Brisbane. On the night of May 10, 1861, they sailed up the Brisbane River. Bishop and priests went to "Dara" (also spelt "Darra"), the original house of that name, a modest little stone structure which belonged to the Collector of Customs and was rented for the first bishop by Mr. P. Mayne.

The Sisters were received by Dean Rigney "in unbroken silence," which they thought might have been prescribed by his rule or might have been a sign of disapproval. It was not a cheerful experience. To reach their quarters for the night they had to cross "a small rude bridge over a tidal creek" (now Creek Street) and, each carrying a bundle, to follow the "rugged" way in the dim light of a lantern held by Father Renehan.

So it all began.

On the following Sunday, May 12, the bishop's Bull of Appointment was read in the beautiful parish church of St. Stephen, which now was Queensland's first cathedral.

APPENDIX

In the article, "James Quinn's Roman Background," in the January number, reference was made to "a great-grandniece of Mary Doyle, etc." who informed the writer on the relationship between Quinns, Cullens and Morans. Actually she is a great-granddaughter of Mary Doyle, a granddaughter of Michael Quinn (the bishop's brother, who remained on the farm at Rathbawn), and a grandniece of the bishop. This good woman is Miss Mary McGrath, of Sandgate, Brisbane. She was a school girl in Bathurst during the last years of the first Bishop of Brisbane, and she supplied valuable family particulars.

Several other witnesses were consulted by the writer in 1959. One was Mr. Alfred Wood, of Nazareth House, Wynnum, who used to serve Bishop Quinn's Mass in St. Stephen's Cathedral and who retained a deep impression of the bishop's height and erect, dignified bearing. He walked in the bishop's funeral procession through the streets, carrying a candle, while all the city mourned and the bells of churches tolled. Mr. Woods died in the latter half of 1959.

Mr. Thomas Stephens, of Windsor, still alert and active at 92, very often saw the bishop when a boy in St. Vincent's Orphanage, Nudgee, and was confirmed there by him. He was helpful in supplying details for a portrait and said the bishop had a fresh complexion, blue eyes, fair-brown hair with some grey in it. Mr. Stephens has since died.

Mr. William Franklin, of Nundah, said his father came out from England on the "Silver Eagle," the ship on which the bishop returned from the Vatican Council and on which William, a baby, learned to walk. His Lordship persuaded Franklin to come on to Brisbane, where he promised he could "place" him. Franklin, senr., became the bishop's first coachman (he had no carriage prior to that) and used to drive him in a landau to such places as Nudgee, where he had a house, "Rathbawn," on the extensive property he bought there from the Crown. Later he settled the Franklin family on a piece of his land in Zillman's Scrub, near Nudgee, and young William used to go to school daily at St. Vincent's. This witness said that the bishop was responsible for the deep

channels which drain the flat country on the sides of the creek which runs between St. Vincent's present property and that of Nudgee College. In William's boyhood days blacks were numerous in the locality and camped mostly on the banks of the creek. Mr. Franklin, now 90, is not a Catholic, but he speaks with respect and affection of the bishop, who he says was a big, friendly man, loved by all sections of the community.

An Italian woman in Brisbane, whose father came out from Italy to work for the bishop, said her parents also lived near Nudgee Orphanage and were visited by Bishop Quinn often. He liked the Italian dishes her mother prepared and used to play bowls outside the house with her father on Sunday afternoons. She, too, through her parents' reminiscences, had nothing but good to say of the apostolic and far-seeing bishop whom Divine Providence placed first in charge of the Church in Queensland.

CORNELIUS ROBERTS

The Pius XII Seminary, Banyo, Queensland.

SHORT NOTICE

SPIRITUAL LETTERS, by Dom John Chapman, O.S.B. The New Ark Library. Sheed and Ward. London, 1959. 342 pp. 7/- (paper bound).

The question arises: Who buys books to-day? It is almost with guilt that one buys a book, priced at two, three or four pounds. Hence needy clerics—who were a standby for so long to booksellers—will welcome the advent of the *New Ark Library*, which publishes excellently printed books, some long out of date, at low cost.

Dom Chapman's *Spiritual Letters* were first printed in 1935, followed almost immediately, such was the demand, by a second edition. Now here is a chance that should not be missed of getting a good, cheap copy, which contains two valuable prefaces by Dom Huddleston, a memoir of Abbot Chapman, and the letters of this gifted convert and retreat giver. Dom Chapman was a scholar, but his spiritual letters, perhaps, will outlive in influence his other writings. He was a master of prayer, and, constantly, he advocated that "if our Faith is to be made vivid, it must be by meditation." On that point scattered through the letters are some most practical passages which are inspiring. Sometimes the criticism has been made of him that in teaching Contemplation he was led to advise the abandonment of discursive meditation, a charge which his editor thinks is unfair. This famous book of 25 years ago will win many new readers in its present excellent form.

T.V.

The Date Of The Last Supper: A New Hypothesis, IV.

Without some knowledge of the mechanics of the construction of the Gospels, the nature of the traditional materials they present, the processes of literary arrangement used to connect their items into a continuous narrative, we cannot see beyond the letter of the text. That letter is always to be respected, but we falsify the intention of the evangelists if we see the Gospels as so many reproductions in the manner of a modern documentary film of the chronological succession of Christ's life, words and actions.

Some of the objections raised against the hypothesis of Jaubert seem to us to suffer from a lack of the necessary literary criticism which, for all its limitations, is required as preliminary spade-work to clear the ground. We ought first to investigate the pre-occupations of the writers before we begin to question the text for the things that interest us, and which can quite easily be secondary in the evangelists' intention. Rather than assessing such objections it will be more profitable to deal with that deficiency, illustrating it with some examples from the objections raised. Then we can point to what seem to be the real difficulties to an acceptance of the hypothesis in order to make a final evaluation possible.

Jaubert considers that the possibility her calender offers to reconcile the Johannine and Synoptic gospels confirms indications in early liturgical and patristic sources which point to the celebration of the Last Supper on Tuesday. This would have been the Passover meal according to the ancient, 'sacerdotal' calendar.

THE STATEMENTS OF THE EVANGELISTS

If we were to choose a criticism which expresses in its broadest terms a general objection it would be this: "The four Evangelists unanimously state that the Last Supper and arrest took place on the eve of the Crucifixion."¹

¹T. A. Burkill, *Numen*, 3 (1956). We have only seen a very brief summary of his criticisms in *Theology Digest*, Spring, 1958, p. 102. In the original article the statement is no doubt developed at length.

We can afford to be careful before we draw the conclusion that they therefore intend to teach us this as a firm point of chronology. For the evangelists have obviously not always insisted on each detail of a given statement. Whereas one states that there were two blind men at Jericho another states that there was one. When one states that the rich man who questioned Christ was young, another states that he was of mature age. And as far as chronological succession of events is concerned what one states to have happened in a certain place at one stage of Christ's ministry, another states happened at a different time and place.²

Similarly in the Gospel story of the Passion, whereas Mt.Mk. state that the prophecy of Peter's denials took place on the way to Gethsemane, Luke states that it happened at the supper. Luke states that Christ's saying about service and pre-eminence took place at the supper, Mt.Mk. have a different setting, during His ministry.

We misconstrue the evangelists' intention if we see in each such 'statement' something that is absolute, to whose each detail he is attaching complete reliance, to each of which he demands our total adhesion. It is certain that outside the Passion story some sayings and incidents were placed together because they were logically connected, not because they happened after one another. In the Passion story the incident of the anointing occupies its present place not by reason of the time it occurred but because the best place to insert a saying of Christ's about His death was at the beginning of the Passion story.

When similar sayings or incidents are connected, or units already formed are inserted into an existing narrative they are connected by phrases of transition which are conventional devices. And we know that the evangelists in the case of the Passion story draw on a traditional narrative which had already assumed a fixed form in oral circulation, even if different communities have differences of detail in their account.³ Into this they insert material they knew of independently from the sources available to each.

Where that material concerns a particular incident its details

²Some instances were provided in an earlier article in last year's A.C.R., pp. 205f.

³Cf. V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, p. 50. In *The Gospel According to St. Mark* he suggests that Mark found an account of the Passion current in Rome and expanded it by the aid of Petrine tradition, p. 658.

may differ from the details of the same story as told elsewhere. Hence a conflict of detail in different evangelists' accounts of the same incident. The story of Peter's denials is a case in point. There was a firm tradition that Peter had denied his Master three times. But the details suffered from a process of attrition passing from mouth to mouth for decades before being written down in the Gospels. If Saint Luke draws his materials from such oral narrative his point is made. Christ was denied three times, as He said He would be, by the prince of the apostles. Here was the depth of His abandonment, here was prophecy fulfilled, here was a serious moral warning for everybody. This much is central in his intention in incorporating that material.

But he knows that Mark has different circumstances surrounding the same central fact, and unless he can be shown to have wanted to correct Mark we must think that he had no more information than the tradition handed on. His use of that oral tradition, or for that matter written material, gives its circumstances of time and place no more value than they had before, and Luke, a historian, certainly was acquainted with the disadvantages of oral tradition in such minor matters. He also knows that once he has given the version available to him a person can see that he is not laying too much insistence on the details of place because Mark has others. He knows as well that what he intended, and what those first communities intended to underline about Christ and Peter and human weakness results quite as clearly from either story, independently of which maid it was to whom he denied the second time.

Even the agreement of the four evangelists on such a circumstance need not mean that they are inculcating it as historic truth. The agreement of the three Synoptics in a given instance need only mean that they all drew their information from the same source, Luke, perhaps, drawing on Mark and he on the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew reproduced in canonical Matthew. If we speak of their "unanimous statement" we seem to infer that we have a clear indication of their insistence on particular circumstances of time and place. Such an inference need not be always justified.

Hence it is not sufficient to say that Jaubert's hypothesis is "contrary to the obvious interpretation of the Gospels."⁴

⁴J. Leal, S.J., *Estudios Ecclesiasticos*, 31 (1957), 173-188, as summarised in *Th. Dig.* A longer summary in *New Testament Abstracts*, Winter, 1958, 109, gives more detailed points of criticism.

Especially in such details no interpretation is canonised simply because it is the obvious one.

At the same time we need some positive indication to depart from it. In the present case we have such an indication in the conflicting indications of the day on which the Last Supper was held. Here the "unanimous statement" of the three Synoptics is opposed to that of John. So we are obliged to compare the different Gospels, to examine how closely those circumstances of time are attached to the story, whether they represent artificial arrangement or whether they represent historical tradition.⁵ We are obliged, too, to consider the legislation of the tract Sanhedrin of the Mishna, for if it could be shown to have been followed in the trial of Christ then we should be sure of at least a day's delay between trial and verdict. Real or historic criticism would give us a sound basis for chronological reconstruction, enabling us to piece together the sequence of events in chronological order from the fragmentary information of the Gospels.

Of the two, literary criticism and real or historic criticism, it is the latter that tells most strongly against Jaubert. On purely literary grounds it seems difficult to rule her hypothesis out of court.

THE SYNOPTIC ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER⁶

The Synoptic accounts of the Last Supper consist of a series of sayings of Christ. He indicates the presence of the traitor, speaks the words of institution, prophesies the denial of Peter, corrects the incomprehension of the apostles about His saying concerning the change of circumstances calling for purse and sword. The accounts are not identical in order, nor even in the sayings recorded. The indication of the traitor is placed before

⁵Cf. Taylor, on Mark 14:1f, "One question to be considered is whether the date is based on historical tradition or whether it belongs to the artificial scheme, illustrated from 11:1 onwards, to bring the events of the Passion within a week."

⁶Cf. "Ceci est mon corps," "Ceci est mon sang," by J. Dupont, O.S.B., in *Nouvelle Revue Theologique*, LXXX (1958), 1025-1041. As do most Catholic authors who deal with the Last Supper, he draws on an article of P. Benoit, O.P., *Le récit de la Cène dans Lc. XXII, 15-20. Etude de critique textuelle et littéraire*, in *Revue Biblique*, XLVIII (1939), 357-393. Since then the Lucan account has been submitted to a meticulous examination by Heinz Schürmann in three volumes, *Der Paschamahlbericht*; Lk. 22 (7-14) 15-18, Münster, 1953; *Der Einsetzungsbericht*; Lk. 22:19, 20, Münster, 1955; *Jesu Abschiedsrede*; Lk. 22:21-38 Münster, 1957.

the words of institution by Mt.Mk., by Luke after. The prediction of Peter's denials is placed during the supper by Luke, but on the way to Gethsemane by Mt.Mk. Luke has sayings not recorded by Mt.Mk.⁷ The sayings about primacy and service which Luke places during the supper are found in another context in Mt.Mk.⁸ We may wonder whether the saying about service is in its right place at the Last Supper, though in this the Lucan tradition rejoins that of John.⁹ It is clear that there has been some arrangement of the available material and the tradition was not binding as to the order of the succession of different sayings.

A number of the sayings that surround the words of institution bring out the prophetic fore-knowledge of Christ. They are self-contained, each unit recording a memorable saying of Christ with sufficient background to explain it. These sayings are linked by similar redactional connections, simple devices to insert material the evangelist did not compose himself but which were already to hand in his sources, oral or written.¹⁰

These sayings come from different traditions. The words of institution themselves are a formulation provided by liturgical tradition. Even here we are faced by literary analysis before we determine how many distinct traditions are represented by the four parallel accounts of the words of institution in the Synoptics and Saint Paul which is closest to the *ipsissima verba* of Christ. In the Synoptic account we are given not a circumstantial narration of events as they happened, but a series of significant sayings.

To this account, thus constituted of several originally separate units, we have as introduction another unit, the preparations for the Pasch. It, too, insists on Christ's prophetic fore-knowledge and we are justifying in considering it, too, as having had an existence separate from the sayings it now introduces.¹¹

It forms part of a group of sayings showing the prophetic knowledge of Christ. With the prediction of the betrayal of Judas, flight of the apostles, denial of Peter, and later the prayer

⁷Lk. 22: 15f, 35-38.

⁸Cf. Lk. 22: 24-27 with Mt. 20: 25-28 and Mk. 10: 42-45.

⁹Cf. John 13: 4, 5, 12-14.

¹⁰Cf. Mk. 14: 18, 22, "And while they were at table and eating," "And while they were eating." Dupont, 1028.

¹¹Cf. Delorme, *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1957, 230, and Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, Oxford, 1955, p. 64.

of Christ in Gethsemane, it clearly shows that Christ knows the fate awaiting Him, that He is going to a voluntary death. In the centre of such a context the prophetic value of the words of institution is highlighted.

Was there any other reason for inserting it here? For it is precisely in this incident that we have the dating characteristic of the Synoptics. In this section only is the Last Supper clearly a Paschal Supper, and in it only at its beginning and end.

The episode is connected with the Last Supper by the transition "When evening was come," binding it simply enough to a story of which it was independent. And it is introduced by the remark, "On the first day of the Azymes when they sacrificed the Pasch." Is this definite historical recollection? Or a redactional process, to describe the supper it introduces as a Paschal meal? Both are possible. Knowing the meal as a Paschal one could have led to the addition of this notation of time. Yet the Paschal character of the supper, if John is right, must have been due to something else. It could have been due to the will of Christ, instituting the Eucharist as a Paschal rite even though it was celebrated before the Paschal feast. In this case, the tradition the Synoptics draw on, true in representing the Last Supper as a Paschal meal, was mistaken in the date it gave it. Since it was known as a Paschal supper it was dated as such.¹² The theology stands, for this is the *novum Pascha novi Regis*, even if the dating falls.

But Jaubert's explanation, in itself, seems quite as reasonable as this. She thinks that when the original tradition was transplanted from a Palestinian milieu its details of time were added by people ignorant of any other Pasch than the legal one, whereas it was, in actual fact a Paschal meal, celebrated according to a calendar they were ignorant of. This was the tradition available to Mark, on whom the other two Synoptics would have drawn.¹³

But that chronological detail is to involve Mark in difficulties.

For the priests after resolving not to have Christ put to death on the feast day, eventually seem to do just that. It may be that Luke the historian saw and avoided this difficulty.¹⁴

¹²Such is the explanation of Benoit in RB, LXV (1959), 593. See also *Bible de Jerusalem*, note on Mt. 26:17.

¹³This explanation could be backed by Jeremias' suggestion that Mk. 14:12, "On the first day of the Azymes, when they sacrificed the Pasch," is "either a mistranslation or else the faulty expression of a non-Jewish author," op. cit. 65.

¹⁴Cf. Mk. 14:2 with Lk. 22:2.

BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN¹⁵

Here again Luke parts company with Mt.Mk. Whereas they mention two sessions of the Sanhedrin, one at night, the other in the morning,¹⁶ Luke mentions only a morning session,¹⁷ even though Christ has been led from the garden to the house of the high priest, where Peter's denials have taken place during the night.

How many sessions were there? Exegetes are divided. Has Luke more precise information not available to Mt.Mk?¹⁸ Is Luke dealing only with the final stages of the trial mentioned by them?¹⁹ Or were there two separate sessions?²⁰ That Mt.Mk. have a trial by night at all could be explained by their placing the incident of the trial inside the story of Peter's denials, from which Luke keeps it separate. The question is not definitely settled on literary grounds. A case can still be made out for Jaubert's two Sanhedrin sessions on Wednesday and Thursday.

THE HORARIUM OF THE GOSPELS²¹

Are there any limitations to the field of hypothesis from other indications of time in the Gospels? It must be admitted that the horarium of Mark is difficult to sustain. After the arrest he distinguishes dawn, the third, sixth and ninth hour.²² Before the third hour, about nine o'clock, there would have occurred a session of the Sanhedrin, the process before Pilate, outrages and way of the cross. When we add from Luke's account the appearance before Herod the difficulty is augmented. Probably Luke realised this, he omits Mark's mention of the third hour. It may be that Mark's distribution of the events is schematic, imposing these hours on a story originally much less precise, possibly because the third, sixth and ninth hours were traditional times of prayer.²³

The horarium of John is much less detailed. He mentions the hours of Christ's rejection by the Jews, the sixth hour on the

¹⁵Cf. Josef Blinzler, *The Trial of Jesus*, Westminster, Maryland, 1959, especially Excursus IV, Luke's Account of the Proceedings Before the Sanhedrin, 115-117.

¹⁶Mk. 14: 53-64; Mt. 26: 57-66.

¹⁷Lk. 22: 66.

¹⁸Benoit, *Jésus devant le Sanhédrin*, *Angelicum*, XX (1943), 158-160.

¹⁹Blinzler, *op. cit.*

²⁰Leal, *N.T.A.*, 109.

²¹Delorme, *op. cit.*, 232.

²²Mk. 15: 1, 25, 33, 42.

²³The suggestion is Delorme's. Cf. Acts 2: 1, 15; 10: 9; 3: 1.

day of preparation for the Pasch. The point of the remark is theological. Christ is rejected at the time of the exclusion of the old leaven in preparation for the Paschal feast, or at the hour of the immolation of the Paschal lambs in the Temple. Whether the procedure started on the day before the Pasch depends on how John's "Before the Paschal feast" is taken. It is generally taken as meaning the evening before the Paschal supper was to be eaten. If taken in a more general way it could be even earlier in the week. John, relating the supper, agony, appearance before Caiphas, but making no mention of the Sanhedrin proceedings, would then pass immediately to the process before Pilate by the connecting phrase "It was morning" which would cover a lapse of some time.²⁴

Pure literary criticism, then, does not disqualify the interpretation of Jaubert. It does not rule her hypothesis out because the texts can be explained on this hypothesis and do not manifestly clash with it.

REAL OR HISTORIC CRITICISM

But if it is not excluded by a consideration of the text, on literary grounds, it fares worse when we ask the question of its likelihood. Is it likely, from what we know of Christ, that He would have followed the characteristically Essene usage of the ancient calendar to determine the day of the Paschal Supper?²⁵

In the light of His known attitude to the Temple and its worship, to constituted authority, sacerdotal and pharisaic, such a usage would be surprising indeed. For if He fiercely condemned scribes and Pharisees for their "vain traditions," for their teaching in relation to the Sabbath, Korban, fasting, tithing and ceremonial washings, still His acknowledgment of their authority was clear.²⁶ At the beginning of the maledictions directed at scribes and Pharisees in St. Matthew's Gospel is an admission of their real authority—they occupy the chair of Moses.²⁷

There is no trace here of an attitude to the principal exponents of the legal calendar to suggest that Christ would have followed the sacerdotal or Essene calendar rather than the legal. The Essenes of Qumran were noted for quite a different attitude to the Temple priesthood. They were characterised by

²⁴Delorme, *op. cit.*, 233.

²⁵Cf. J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*, London, 1959, 112f; Delorme, 233; Benoit, *RB LXV* (1958), 593f.

²⁶V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, London, 1955, 71f.

²⁷Mt. 23:2.

their withdrawal from the worship of the Temple.²⁸ They did not acknowledge the legitimacy of the Temple priesthood and considered that their sacrifices were unlawful. And it is highly likely that one determining factor in their attitude was that the calendar that they considered sacred had been rejected in the Temple feasts and official worship.²⁹

Whatever affinity can be shown to have existed between the early Christians and the Qumran community,³⁰ there is no trace of this attitude to the priests and the Temple in the conduct of Christ. Far from denying their legitimacy and the lawfulness of their sacrifices, He sends a leper to the priests to have sacrifice offered.³¹ Together with the disciples, He is reported as observing other Jewish festivals according to the orthodox Jewish calendar, making pilgrimages to Jerusalem at the time prescribed in the Law.³² And while on the one hand Christ and the Apostles celebrated the feast of Encaenia, which is not even mentioned in Essene writings, on the other there is no mention in the Gospels of those feasts which were proper to the Essenes.³³

If the Last Supper was a Paschal meal, when and where was the Paschal lamb slain? Surely not in the Temple on a date the priests would have considered unlawful. But we have no indication that the lamb was slain privately at this period, least of all in Jerusalem.

Finally, as to the likelihood that Christ's trial was conducted according to the rules of the Mishna, the least that can be said is that it would be most unwise to use it as a basis or support for such a hypothesis as Jaubert's. The oldest of the traditions systematised in the tract Sanhedrin have been attributed to Rabbi Meir around the middle of the second century. His description is suspect as representing the view of the scribes and can hardly depend on the memory of living persons for the practices of the

²⁸Millar Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London, 1958, p. 258.

²⁹Milik, *op. cit.*, 82:111.

³⁰Most books on Qumran deal with these similarities, though not all are of any lasting worth. The best to date are those of Milik, interesting in another respect for its *Imprimatur* and *Nihil Obstat* on the opening pages of an S.C.M. publication, Burrows, and Frank Moore Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, New York, 1958. J. P. Audet, O.P., has recently seen the influence of the 'sacerdotal' calendar in the curious gloss on Lk. 6:1, "In sabbato deuteroproto." Cf. E. Vogt, S.J., in *Biblica*, 40 (1959), 102-105.

³¹Cf. Lk. 17:14 with Lev. 14:10; Mt. 5:23ff.

³²Especially in John, e.g., 2:13; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2, 10; 10:22.

³³Milik considers that this "renders impossible" Jaubert's hypothesis. Cf. *op. cit.*, 113.

Sanhedrin before the cataclysm of 70 A.D. There is an idealisation of juridical practice in the tract, and its greater humanity is due to the modification of a harsher system through the gradual influence of the Pharisees. But this influence cannot be shown to have affected legal procedure in the time of Christ.

A recent Catholic author has stated in concluding a study of the Mishnaic criminal code that "everything that has hitherto been attacked as an illegality in the trial of Jesus, in view of the criminal code outlined in the Mishna, was completely in accordance with the criminal code then in force, which was a Sadducean code, and did not know or recognize those Pharisaic, humanitarian features of the Mishna code which were not based on the Old Testament."³⁴

CONCLUSION.

The 'sacerdotal' calendar was in use in a restricted circle during and after the time of Christ. It has not been proved that it was followed at any time by Christ. If we had sufficient indications from sources outside the Gospels to indicate the likelihood of its use it could be reconciled with the chronological data the Gospels contain. All the information we have in the Gospels points in the other direction.

Forty-odd pages would be an unconscionable distance to lead an unsuspecting reader to such a negative conclusion if the journey itself had not sufficient interest to compensate for its unspectacular destination. Jaubert's hypothesis shows a continuity of liturgical usage which shaped pages of the Old Testament, apocryphal literature, the material of Qumran and its usages and continued into patristic times. It shows in a concrete instance the real value and the equally real limitations of the material from Qumran. Most important of all, it obliges us to examine the construction of the Gospels and the primary interests of their writers. A number of valuable Lives of Christ have habituated us to look for precise circumstances of time, place and persons. No Christian would quarrel with a praiseworthy search directed to conjuring up a vivid image of the Son of God in all the human reality of His daily life. But we must resign ourselves to what the Evangelists give us and realise clearly that it was not to give us a Book of Hours of the Passion that they wrote. For them the Passion of Christ was not so much a matter for chronological

³⁴Blinzler, *op. cit.* Excursus VI "On the Question of Whether the Mishnic Code Was in Operation in the Time of Jesus," 149-156.

research but a drama in which to expose the inscrutable designs of God in the mystery of "a crucified Christ, a scandal to the Jews, folly to the Gentiles, but to us who have been called, Jews and Gentiles alike, Christ the power of God, Christ the wisdom of God."

The End

JEROME CROWE, C.P.

St. Paul's Retreat,
Urrbrae, Mitcham,
South Australia.

[Father Crowe's previous articles were in the January, April and July numbers of the A.C.R., 1959.]

SHORT NOTICE

ST. ODO OF CLUNY, by John of Salerno. Translated and edited by Dom G. Sitwell, O.S.B. Sheed and Ward, London, 1958. Price in England, 16/- sterling.

This is a volume in the "Makers of Christendom" series. The series has provided some very interesting documents showing the evolution of mediaeval Europe. Odo of Cluny was one of the great monastic figures of the Middle Ages when order was beginning to emerge from the chaos of the Dark Ages. You see something of both in his life: the passionate disorder of lands laid waste by pirates and outlaws, and given over to the rule of the strong; the preservation and growth of religious institutions and ideas in spite of all. The late Professor Fliche gave Odo an important place at the beginning of his *Reforme Gregorienne*, a work which is not included in Dom Sitwell's bibliography. Monasticism and monastic reform, preservation of civilisation and the regaining of contact between Rome and the north of Europe—these are themes to be found in the life of Odo.

Unfortunately John of Salerno's biography is a dull piece of writing; garrulous without being picturesque, it has the credulity but not the delightful naivete of many of the mediaeval chroniclers. From its innumerable trivia, laboriously set down, you have to pick out the few incidents which throw light on the history of his period.

St. Odo's biography of St. Gerald of Aurillac is added and does little to relieve the reader's gloom.

V.M.

Moral Theology

INTENTION WHEN CONTRACTING MARRIAGE

Dear Rev. Sir,

One of the questions in the pre-nuptial enquiry is: "Do you intend to contract Marriage in accordance with the teachings of the Catholic Church?" As many non-catholics believe in divorce and contraception, should they answer "No," to this question? What about agnostics?

MIRANS.

REPLY

The purpose of the question quoted from the pre-nuptial enquiry is to ensure that the parties to a marriage have the intention of conforming themselves to the teaching of the Church when entering the matrimonial contract. Whatever be their own personal views on the nature of marriage and its obligations, they intend to frame their consent according to the mind of the Church. By wishing to do what the Church does, they undoubtedly enter a valid marriage: if left to formulate intentions according to their own erroneous notions, there may be danger that the marriage be invalid. A negative answer to the question cited would make it impossible for the priest to assist at the marriage.

Unfortunately, there are many who admit that even consummated Christian marriage may be dissolved by divorce granted in accordance with the provisions of civil law; and there are many also who do not understand that the use of contraceptives destroys the very purpose of marriage. Non-catholics, generally, do not recognise the sacramental dignity of matrimony, while those who have no religious beliefs of any kind must logically regard it as a mere human agreement. These intellectual convictions may exercise an influence on the consent which is the source and cause of marriage. On the other hand, they may be simple errors which do not stand in the way of a correct intention of contracting marriage, as it should be, with a view to the parties becoming lawful man and wife.

Divorce is opposed to an essential property of marriage, its indissolubility, and is contrary to the *bonum sacramenti*. The use of contraceptives makes it impossible for the relations between

man and woman to produce the natural effect of generation: contraceptive intercourse is against the *bonum prolis*. Marriage, which is always a sacred contract, is also the Sacrament between Christians. The contract and the Sacrament are not two things, but the Sacrament is the contract, raised by our Lord to the dignity of a great Sacrament, a sign of the union between Christ and his Church and productive of grace in the souls of those who receive it.

An explicit condition that the marriage could be dissolved in certain circumstances would be an obstacle to true matrimonial consent and would vitiate the contract. Indissolubility is of the essence of marriage, and one who excludes it, necessarily excludes all intention of valid marriage. Marriage is not a human but a divine institution; it is contracted in accord with the divine law governing its essentials, or is not contracted at all. Likewise, a marriage with a restriction that the right to acts, naturally and of themselves suitable for the generation of children, is not mutually interchanged would be null and void. Contraceptive intercourse is not an act suitable for generation; it is destined to prevent generation. The object of the marriage contract is the right to each other's body with a view to generative acts. A contract purporting to give the right to un-natural sexual acts would be a *contractus turpis* and invalid: in no sense could it be considered as a valid marriage according to the law of nature, much less a Sacrament of the New Law. A Christian, who explicitly excluded the intention to receive a Sacrament when being joined in wedlock with another Christian, would exclude the intention to contract a valid marriage. Whether he wishes it or not, he cannot have the contract without the Sacrament; and if he positively does not wish for the Sacrament, he does not enter a valid matrimonial contract. Even agnostics who were once baptised either receive the Sacrament of Matrimony (provided the other party is also baptised) or they are not married at all.

How can a person, whose intellectual convictions are at variance with the truth concerning marriage, sincerely intend to enter a matrimonial union which is valid and binding? Would not the inclinations of his will seem to be directly contrary to what the Catholic Church teaches is required for valid marriage? If Titius believes marriage may be dissolved by divorce, can he seriously be considered to bind himself to an indissoluble union?

While he is convinced that contraceptive intercourse is all that is demanded by the married state, can he really give the right to truly generative acts? He no longer believes in Sacraments, how can he receive one? Since his intellect assents to what is an obstacle to matrimonial consent, can he enter a union which the Catholic Church will recognise as a valid marriage; or should he answer "No" to the question on the enquiry form and honestly go elsewhere to be "married?" Apparently, he is expected to answer "Yes," and the difficulty put by our correspondent is to know how this can be.

The key to the solution is found in the fact that marriage is a contract; and a contract is the consent of two (or more, but in the case of the matrimonial contract only two) persons to the same exchange of rights. Consent is an act of the will, not an act of the intellect. It is true that the act of the will presupposes that of the intellect, according to the axiom: *nil volitum nisi cognitum*. Any consent of the will to what is an unknown matter is obviously invalid. A person could not be validly married unless he knew what marriage was; but it is not necessary that he know everything that is to be known about it. A minimum of distinct knowledge is required of him; and if in this he implicitly includes whatever else comes under the term of true matrimonial rights, he can validly contract marriage, notwithstanding that he is gravely mistaken in his own mind as to some aspects of the nature and obligations of marriage.¹ His intellectual errors are called "simple errors," for the reason that they remain, in fact, purely speculative and have no influence on the consent of the will, which is the cause of the matrimonial contract. They are over-ruled by the predominant intention to enter a matrimonial union and not to embark on a life of concubinage. The Church's legislation adopts this position and reasonably so. "Simple error regarding the unity or indissolubility or sacramental dignity of marriage . . . does not vitiate matrimonial consent" (can. 1084). The legislator further states that this holds "even though it (simple error) is the cause of the

¹The minimum required is that the parties know marriage is a permanent society between man and woman for the purpose of procreating children (can. 1082). By a permanent society is not necessarily meant a union that can never be dissolved, but at least something which is stable and more than a transient association. It is also necessary that the contracting parties know that children are begotten by corporal union of their parents, although they may be ignorant of the intimate details of conjugal relations.

contract" (ibid.). Simple error is the cause of the contract in the case where Titius would not have entered matrimony had he realised marriage was indissoluble, etc. If he marries *because* marriage may be dissolved, it is no longer simple error and something purely speculative, and such a contract would be invalid. ". . . If either party or both parties, by a positive act of the will exclude marriage itself, or all right to the conjugal act, or any essential property of marriage, the marriage contract is invalid" (can. 1086, par. 2). Internal consent is always presumed to be in agreement with the words or signs which are used in the celebration of marriage (can. 1086, par. 1). The marriage ceremony of the Roman Ritual and in the Rituals approved for various countries is carefully drawn up to express true matrimonial consent. What Titius would have done, had he known differently, is not a matter for consideration. We are interested only in what he actually did. He intended to be joined in true and lawful wedlock; and in this definite and over-ruling intention is included all that valid marriage implies, notwithstanding any erroneous notions which Titius may harbour on the subject of what marriage ought to be.

In practice, it may not be always easy to decide whether a party to a marriage laboured under a simple error or actually gave vitiated consent, in accordance with his own ideas of marriage. To ensure the validity of the contract and establish that he intended to conform with the true concepts of marriage, he is correctly asked the question to which our correspondent has drawn attention.

LATE ARRIVALS AT MASS

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is it correct for the church wardens to continue to take late-comers to vacant seats, long after Mass has begun? Is it encouraging the late-comers, especially as they seem to be the same people every Sunday? In some cases the parents bring their children late practically on every occasion.

PAROCHUS.

REPLY

The query would seem to be rather pastoral than moral. The moral aspect concerns the fault of those who come late,

and the co-operation of the church wardens. The precept of Sunday Mass imposes the obligation to be present for the entire Mass. It is a grave precept, but admits of venial matter. All would agree that a person who was present from the gospel to the end of Mass had substantially fulfilled his obligation, and had not been guilty of serious sin, even if there were no extenuating circumstances. Many theologians are more lenient and hold that the omission of the entire Mass of the Catechumens does not amount to grave matter. Of course, this does not mean that we can be satisfied with attendance at Mass only from the beginning of the Offertory to the end of the sacred function. Every effort should be made to encourage the parishioners to come early, but there is no great reason to be upset because a small proportion are late, some of them even habitually. As for the co-operation of the church wardens: if there be any co-operation, it seems to be so remote and indirect as to be negligible. One might argue that they were making the best of a rather unsatisfactory situation, by affording the late-comers every opportunity to assist devoutly at the remainder of the Mass.

From the pastoral viewpoint: Every priest knows from experience that there will always be some who are unavoidably late on particular occasions, and manage to come at all, only with much difficulty. Under any consideration, it would seem unfair to deny these faithful parishioners a place to kneel or sit while they do their best to fulfil their religious duties. On the other hand, there are those who appear to be always late. It would be rash to conclude without further evidence that they had no reason for not being in the church before Mass began. The same reason may hold even every Sunday, especially in the case of parents with young families, who have to care for their children, dress them and bring them to Mass. Let us think of the parents who do not bother to bring their children to Mass or, perhaps, make an excuse of tending to the children for being absent themselves. If late arrivals are not directed to a convenient place in the church, will they be left standing at the back? That would not seem the correct thing. Will they be allowed to find a place for themselves? This would cause even more distraction to the congregation than quietly to show them where they can assist at the holy Sacrifice. Some are late, and we know they do not take the trouble to be early. It does no harm to extend to them the same courtesies as are given to the rest of

the faithful. Their devotion may have grown somewhat cold, and any harshness or discrimination, especially in the church and before the other members of the congregation, could possibly annoy them to the extent that they would not come at all next Sunday or for many Sundays. It is infinitely preferable to be late for Mass than to stay away altogether. The custom of the church wardens to show the people to a vacant place in the church, where such a custom exists, seems laudable; nor does there appear to be sufficient reason why the late-comers should be denied the benefits arising therefrom.

A CASE OF SERVILE WORK

Dear Rev. Sir,

What do you think of the custom of counting and rolling money on Sundays? Is it servile work, and if so, is it justified by immemorial custom or otherwise?

CURATE.

REPLY

The theoretical distinction between servile and liberal works is rather easily made according to the traditional teaching; but the classification of a particular activity is often difficult, and may remain uncertain. In general, servile works are those which require corporal rather than mental activity, tend to satisfy bodily needs, and in times past were performed by slaves or servants. In present social conditions, servile work is that usually performed by tradesmen or labourers. In opposition to servile work is liberal work, which we now class as professional occupation. It is more the normal work of the members of the community who earn their living by mental rather than bodily effort. The distinction is not clear-cut, and some works can come under either head. An example would be driving a motor car, which a taxi driver finds exhausting work and a holiday maker nothing but relaxation. Servile works are forbidden on Sundays and Feasts of precept; liberal works are allowed, and in case of doubt we may follow the custom of the place where we are.

Counting money is an occupation many would like to engage on, provided it were their own money and there were an abundance of it to count. Counting money for another person is a different matter; it does not elevate the mind to great heights of intellectual satisfaction. Neither does it require bodily labour

to any extent. It calls for a certain attention and concentration, if one is to avoid mistakes which can be costly. On the whole, it seems to be outside the ambit of purely servile work. In the business world it is done by bank officials and the office staff rather than by craftsmen or those engaged in manual occupations. Public markets, fairs and other public buying and selling are forbidden on Sundays and Feasts of precept, except legitimate custom or special indult allows them (can. 1248). Counting money necessarily connected with such business transactions would be part of the general unlawful act of Sunday trading. Caring for the proper disposal of money given for religious purposes on Sunday would not be servile work.

CO-OPERATION OF HUSBAND IN SINFUL ACT OF WIFE

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is it ever lawful for a husband to have conjugal relations with his wife, when he knows that she has inserted a pessary to prevent the passage of the semen to the uterus?

PASTOR.

REPLY

Some years ago the question was treated in these notes (A.C.R., 1949, Jan. p. 42, July p. 224). The conclusion arrived at was that the co-operation of the husband in this sin of his wife was always formal co-operation and could be justified in no circumstances. The arguments then advanced were briefly these:

1. The conjugal act requires the co-operation of two persons, man and woman, who by their common act become a single principle of procreation, two in one flesh. To be lawful, this act must be suitable for the purpose for which it is naturally destined. In so far as it depends on the will of the parties concerned and is a human act, it must be so performed that generation could follow. It must be an act *de se aptus ad generandum*.

2. Voluntary interference with the act, to the extent that generation becomes impossible, is a grave violation of the natural law. It is an abuse of a faculty given by the Creator for a definite purpose, and is contrary to the good of the human race.

3. Either party could cause the act to be no longer possessing

all that is necessary for generation; or both parties could conspire to bring about the evil result.

4. Where both conspire to frustrate the natural tendency of the act, then both are equally guilty, although the actual destruction of the sperm may be the result of the physical action of one party only. The other party is a formal co-operator by reason of the consent which is the basis of their common design.

5. If one party could be purely passive, he (or she) would not necessarily give consent directly to the frustration of the conjugal act—which would be the sole responsibility of the other. The question, however, is how one party can be passive in the conjugal act. It is a common act, requiring, as we have noted, the co-operation of both man and woman. It is possible for the wife to be opposed to the *interruption* of the act on the part of the husband. It is also possible for the wife to frustrate the *result* of the act after it has been naturally complete. But it does not seem possible for either to be passive in *ipso actu communi perficiendo*. Thus, the wife who allows her husband to have conjugal relations while he has provided himself with some instrument to prevent entrance of the *semen* is not passive. She is making herself available as a means to commit a serious violation of the natural law. Likewise, the husband who has intercourse with his wife, who has inserted a pessary or used some preparation to kill the sperm in the vagina, is actively engaged in something which necessarily leads to the frustration of the means of procreation. If the part played by the wife is not *de se* suitable for generation, neither is the act of the husband; for neither can perform the generative act without the proper and natural assistance of the other.

This attitude would seem to be the only practical one in the light of a communication from the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office (21st April, 1955), sent privately to the Bishops of America.² The salient points are:

(a) The Holy Office expresses concern at the growing practice of artificial onanism, through recourse to various chemical and mechanical devices. The use of contraceptives of any kind, whether they prevent the entrance of the *semen* to the vagina, or kill the sperm after intercourse or block the

²The text of the communication may be read in the *Canon Law Digest*, 1958 Supplement, by Bouscaren and O'Connor (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee).

passage of the *semen* to the *uterus* may be all classed as artificial onanism; and so are included in the object of alarm by the Holy See.

(b) Descending to a particular form of onanism, the application of pessaries (sterilet, diaphragm) by married couples in the exercise of their marital rights is utterly condemned and rejected as intrinsically evil. Whoever is responsible for their use is guilty of serious sin.

(c) With regard to the co-operation of the husband with his wife who uses such a device, the faithful must not be told that no serious objection may be made, according to the principles of Christian law, if he co-operates only materially. The document does not explicitly declare that such material co-operation is speculatively impossible, as we have maintained; it seems to be confined to the plane of practical instruction. The teaching that material co-operation of the husband is lawful cannot be followed.

(d) The Instruction does not confine itself to generalities. In the next paragraph, it refers to confessors and spiritual directors, who guide the consciences of individual persons. Priests charged with these offices, who hold that the co-operation of the husband is open to no serious objection are "straying far from the paths of truth and righteousness."

(e) Finally, publications, public discussions, conferences, etc., about lawfulness of such co-operation on the part of the husband are strictly forbidden. The reason would seem to be lest the faithful be left under the impression that such a procedure may be justified or at least probably lawful.

The lowest valuation of the document of the Holy Office is that it is a practical instruction to the Bishops of America aimed at forbidding any support for the teaching that the husband may sometimes co-operate materially with his wife in the sin of onanism. While it does not go to the lengths of declaring all such co-operation necessarily formal, it definitely implies that the doctrine mentioned is dangerous and forbids it to be reduced to practice. The moral law is universal in its application. What is sinful in one country, as being contrary to the laws of Christian morality, cannot be permitted in other places.

JAMES MADDEN.

St Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Canon Law

IS PENALTY OF EXCOMMUNICATION ALWAYS INCURRED BY CATHOLIC PARTY IN MARRIAGE IN NON-CATHOLIC CHURCH?—IS THIS PENALTY INCURRED BY CATHOLIC FATHER WHO PARTICIPATES IN MARRIAGE OF CATHOLIC DAUGHTER IN NON-CATHOLIC CHURCH?

Dear Rev. Sir,

Very recently I heard of a marriage case which has prompted me to ask the following questions. I think that some comment on them in the pages of the A.C.R. would be of interest to readers:

1. Does a Catholic who goes through the form of marriage in a non-catholic church always incur the penalty of excommunication?

2. Does a Catholic father who participates in such a ceremony to the extent of "giving away" his Catholic daughter also incur the penalty of excommunication?

PASTOR.

FIRST QUESTION

While it is true that the first query of our correspondent can now be answered without any great difficulty, it must also be said that this was not always the case. For our correspondent, in proposing a question which on the surface appears as a straight-forward question, has revived a matter about which there was at one stage considerable discussion among the canonists. Thus, it will give a greater appreciation of our correspondent's question and its answer if we here examine this discussion and its authoritative solution.

Two canons are directly and immediately involved in this first query, namely, canons 2319, §1, 1° and canon 1063, §1. Up to 25th December, 1953, this relevant section of canon 2319 read as follows: "§1. Catholics are under an excommunication *latae sententiae* reserved to the Ordinary: 1°. Who contract marriage before a non-catholic minister contrary to the ruling of canon 1063, §1. . . ." In turn, canon 1063, §1 states: "Even though a dispensation from the impediment of Mixed Religion has been obtained from the Church the spouses cannot, either

before or after the marriage contracted before the Church, also go, whether in person or by proxy, to a non-catholic minister as a minister of religion, for the purpose of giving or renewing their matrimonial consent."

Our correspondent's question is concerned principally with the penalty to be incurred in the case proposed by him, and thus it is concerned principally with canon 2319, §1, 1°. However, before 25th December, 1953, as we have already suggested, canon 2319, §1, 1° explicitly mentioned canon 1063, §1, and this very point was the cause of difficulty and controversy. In this controversy it was maintained by not a few authors that it was possible for a Catholic to go through the form of marriage before a non-catholic minister acting in that capacity without incurring the penalty of automatic excommunication expressly provided in canon 2319, §1, 1°.

In order to understand their position it will be necessary to draw attention to certain other canons which express a most important principle that finds application in any such matter concerned with penalties. Canon 2219 states: "§1. In penalties the more benign interpretation is to be applied. . . . §3. It is not lawful to extend a penalty from person to person or from case to case, even though the same reason, or even a graver reason, is present, without prejudice to the provision of canon 2231." Moreover, canon 19 states: "Laws which enact penalties . . . are subject to strict interpretation." From the combined consideration of these canons it is clear that the mind of the legislator is that laws which enact a penalty, such as canon 2319 with which our correspondent's question is concerned, are to be given a narrow interpretation; in effect, it means that through this principle set down by the legislator himself the severity of these laws is mitigated so that these laws in a sense extend a certain favouritism to delinquents because they are to be applied only to those persons and those matters which are clearly included in the text, and are not to be applied to any others even though strong similarities may exist and even though there may appear to be at least as much reason for so doing.

With such principles in mind these authors pointed out that canon 2319, §1, 1° did not simply inflict the penalty of excommunication upon a Catholic who goes through a form of marriage before a non-catholic minister acting in his religious capacity, but rather on a Catholic who contracts a Mixed Marriage in such

circumstances before or after a marriage contracted before the Church. Thus, it was argued that two Catholics who went through a form of marriage between themselves before a non-catholic minister acting as such would not incur the penalty of excommunication, since the penalty was imposed—so they argued—only when a Mixed Marriage was concerned, and a marriage between two Catholics was certainly not a Mixed Marriage. It might have been argued that a Catholic who does go through a form of marriage before a non-catholic minister acting in his official capacity performs the seriously wrong act of participation *in sacris* that the legislator has in mind to prohibit and punish, and that it does not make any difference whether he goes through the ceremony with a non-catholic or another Catholic. However, while there would have appeared to be much merit in such a line of reasoning, these authors of whom we are speaking insisted that it must be kept in mind that the problem under consideration is concerned with the matter of penalties, and that in the matter of penalties there are certain principles which, in accordance with the mind of the same legislator, are not to be ignored but rather must find application. These principles have already been set down, and since they state that penalties are to be strictly interpreted and that penalties are not to be extended to similar cases even when there might appear to be at least equal, and even greater, reason for so doing, it followed—these authors argued—that the penalty which we are now discussing was not to be urged in the case where the marriage before the non-catholic minister acting in his religious capacity was between two Catholics.

Some authors also sought to argue that the penalty of canon 2319, §1, 1° would not be incurred by the Catholic party in such a marriage if the non-catholic party had not been baptized. The reason adduced to support this contention was that canon 2319, §1, 1° specifically mentioned canon 1063 (“... contra praescriptum can. 1063, §1”), and canon 1063 is concerned only with the impediment of Mixed Religion and not Disparity of Cult. Thus, again drawing attention to the principles concerning the strict application of laws which enact penalties, these authors argued that the penalty of canon 2319, §1, 1° should not be urged against the Catholic party to a marriage before the non-catholic minister when the non-catholic party to the marriage was not baptized.

In passing, however, it may be remarked that it did seem that this argument based on the benign interpretation of laws enacting penalties did not possess the same force in its application to this particular case as it did in its application to the case previously discussed, that is, where the marriage before the non-catholic minister was between two Catholics. The principal reason why it appeared to possess less force in the case where the non-catholic party was not baptized was that another canon, namely, canon 1071, states quite clearly that the provisions contained in canons 1060-1064 concerning marriages involving the impediment of Mixed Religion are to be applied also to marriages involving the impediment of Disparity of Cult. This means that the legislator is explicitly applying the prohibition of canon 1063, §1 (concerning Mixed Religion) to marriages in which the impediment of Disparity of Cult exists. Consequently, it could well have been argued that when the legislator spoke in canon 2319, §1, 1° of the incurrance of an excommunication for the violation of the provisions of canon 1063, §1, he was also sufficiently stating that it applied equally whether the impediment involved was Mixed Religion or Disparity of Cult. Nevertheless, some authors maintained the opinion that this case was not covered by the law, and that the penalty of canon 2319, §1, 1° did not extend to such a case.

It was also pointed out that there was even another possibility. Canon 1063, §1 has these words: "... either before or after the marriage contracted before the Church. . . ." In consequence it was even suggested that, in accordance with the principles relating to the strict interpretation of laws enacting penalties, the penalty of canon 2319, §1, 1° should not be urged where the ceremony before the non-catholic minister was the only ceremony. Did not the strict interpretation of the relevant canon imply that the legislator was concerned with such a ceremony only when the Catholic ceremony had preceded or would follow?

Thus, while the opinion was defended that the penalty of excommunication embraced each of the cases that we have now mentioned so that there was no exception, there were authors who were prepared to exempt one or more of these cases from the penalty. This was especially true of the case where the marriage before the non-catholic minister was between two Catholics; while not so many defended the exemption for the other two cases. However, it would be true to say that even those canonists

who maintained that these cases, or some of them, should be interpreted so as not to be embraced by the penalty of canon 2319, §1, 1°, would have conceded that the offenders in such cases would be subject to the provisions of canon 2315 and 2316. These two canons impose the penalties of suspicion of heresy for participation with heretics in sacred rites, and, provided certain additional conditions are fulfilled, even liability to the penalties attached to heresy itself. It is also true that, on account of the special nature and circumstances of such cases, there might be question of the incurrance of the penalty of excommunication set down in canon 2319, §1, 2°, namely, if there should exist prior to the marriage an agreement, whether explicit or implicit, that any of the children of the marriage should be educated outside the Catholic Church.

However, all room for doubt and discussion in this matter has now been removed by a *Motu Proprio* of Pope Pius XII, dated 25th December, 1953. This *Motu Proprio* stated that some canonists had "extenuated the force of canon 2319, §1, 1°, insisting too much on the ruling of canon 1063 §1, referred to therein, and teaching that not every marriage contracted or attempted by Catholics before a non-catholic minister is punished with excommunication reserved to the Ordinary." The *Motu Proprio* then proceeded to state that "lest the faithful, ~~freed from the fear of~~ penalty, should dare to commit such a crime, We, having heard the Eminent Fathers of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, *motu proprio* and of the plenitude of Apostolic power decree and order the deletion from canon 2319, §1, 1° of the words: *contra praescriptum can. 1063, §1.*"

Consequently, the answer to our correspondent's query must be given in the light of this ruling of the *Motu Proprio* of Pius XII. It is now clear as a result of the ruling of this document that the penalty of excommunication set down in canon 2319, §1, 1° is involved in the marriage, whether in person or by proxy—of any Catholic before a non-catholic minister acting in his religious capacity; and hence that this is true even if the attempted marriage is such as to bring it within any of the three categories described above which had been suggested as exceptions to the ruling of this canon. For the basis of these previously defended exceptions has been completely removed from the canon, namely, the words: *contra praescriptum can. 1063, §1.*

SECOND QUESTION

It is now clear that the penalty set down in canon 2319, §1, 1° is incurred by any Catholic party who endeavours to contract a marriage before a non-catholic minister acting in his religious capacity. In view of the contents of that section of the canon itself and of the principle that laws enacting penalties are to be strictly interpreted, it would certainly appear that in the case proposed by our correspondent only the daughter would incur the excommunication and that the penalty would not be incurred by the father despite his participation in the religious ceremony. This, in fact, is our answer to our correspondent's query.

However, there are two canons which might conceivably be used in an endeavour to show that at least in certain circumstances the penalty of excommunication might also be incurred by the father in a case such as that described by our correspondent. Thus, canon 2209, §3 states: "Not only the person who commands (the commission of a crime), and who is the principal author of the crime, but also those who induce another or concur in the commission of the crime in any way, incur an imputability that, all things being equal, is not less than that of the perpetrator himself of the crime, if the crime would not have been committed without their help." And canon 2231 asserts: "If several persons co-operate in the commission of a crime, even though the law speaks of only one person, those who are mentioned in canon 2209, §1-§3 are bound by the same penalty unless the law expressly provides the contrary; other accomplices, however, are not bound, but are to be punished with some other just penalty at the prudent discretion of the superior, unless the law determines a particular penalty even for them."

The implication of the combined consideration of these two canons is that, where a crime is committed, not only the person who actually performs the act, but also those who assist that person to perform the act, incur the same penalty, provided that in the case of the accomplices their assistance is such that the act would not have been performed without them. If we apply these principles to the case proposed by our correspondent the following conclusions emerge: (1) It is possible that the Catholic father who performs the act of "giving away" his Catholic daughter in a marriage ceremony in a non-catholic church could also incur the penalty of excommunication that in law is attached to the act of the daughter by canon 2319, 1§, 1°; (2) The father

would incur the penalty if his co-operation is of such a nature that the marriage of his daughter in the non-catholic church would not have taken place without such assistance on his part; (3) Unless it can be demonstrated that the father's assistance is of such a nature he does not incur the penalty.

It appears to us that in such cases as that proposed by our correspondent it would generally be true that it would be extremely difficult to establish that the father's co-operation would be such that the marriage would not have taken place without it. Rather, not only do we think that it would be extremely difficult to establish such a connection between the two acts, but we are of the opinion that in point of fact a connection of this nature does not exist. That is, we are of the opinion that it is a general truth that these marriages would certainly take place whether or not the father participated in the ceremony in this manner.

We have restricted ourselves to the precise question asked by our correspondent. Hence, for that reason we have not concerned ourselves with the matter of scandal and the obligation of subsequent reparation, nor with the possibility of the father's incurring the penalties of canons 2315 and 2316, that is, the penalty of suspicion of heresy for participation in sacred rites with heretics and the subsequent liability to the penalties attached to heresy for failure to amend.

G. C. GALLEN.

St. Mary's Cathedral, Sydney.

SHORT NOTICE

The *Australasian Catholic Record* extends its congratulations to the Fellowship For Biblical Studies on the occasion of the first printed number of the AUSTRALIAN BIBLICAL REVIEW (Vol. VII, Nos. 1-4, Melbourne, 1959. Pp. 34. 10/-). The association embraces within its membership not only adherents of all the major Christian denominations (the President last year was Rev. Father Nicholas Warne, O.F.M.) but also members of the Jewish religion.

Not a few Catholic scholars are members of the Fellowship or contributors to the review. The scholarly approach to Biblical questions, fostered by the editors from the early days, has won regard and support for the review. The editors hope that the new printed journal will bring the work of Australian scholars to the attention of their fellow workers in the Biblical field outside Australia. The present issue consists of a series of articles followed by a book review section. Information can be obtained from the Fellowship For Biblical Studies, c/o Academic Secretary, University of Melbourne.

Australasian Catholic Record.

Liturgy

RENEWING HOSTS

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would you please discuss the following item in the A.C.R.?

According to the prescriptions of Canon Law in relation to the Sacred Species, hosts must be always fresh, and, therefore, frequently renewed, to avoid danger of decomposition. In a discussion recently it was stated that there is an obligation to renew the Sacred Species every week, even though the hosts are from the same supply of altar breads. If, for example, a priest received a fresh supply of altar breads every month or six weeks, would that mean that he would still have to renew the Sacred Species each week, even though the newly consecrated Hosts would have been from the same supply of altar breads as the previous Hosts? Or does the obligation to renew the Sacred Species refer only to each new arrival of fresh altar breads?

I would be grateful if you would discuss this problem.

—D.J.S.

REPLY

The prescriptions of the Code of Canon Law on this matter are found in two canons.

Can. 815, §1, determining the matter of the Eucharist, states that the bread must be wheaten and freshly made (*recenter confectus*) in order to avoid all danger of corruption.

Can. 1272, under the general heading of the reservation and worship of the Eucharist, legislates for the renewing of the Sacred Species. The consecrated hosts, both for communicating the faithful and for Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, must be fresh and frequently renewed (*et recentes sint et frequenter renoventur*). The old hosts are to be duly consumed, and in this way there will be no danger of corruption. The instructions that the local Ordinary may issue in this matter are to be carefully observed.

The law of the Code, then, determines that the hosts to be consecrated must be freshly made, and that the consecrated hosts reserved in the tabernacle are to be frequently renewed. But these laws do not determine precisely the meaning of the word 'fresh,' nor what 'frequently renewed' means in terms of days. These determinations will come from other sources, such as the decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, the Congregation of the Sacraments, and the legislation of the local Ordinary, which the Code explicitly states must be observed.

The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* (1, vi, 2), in describing the duties of the Sacristan, lays down that he must see that the Blessed Sacrament is changed and renewed at least once a week.

A reply of the Congregation of Rites (2650, 1—16th Dec., 1826) condemns a custom of making the breads only once every three months during the winter, and once every six months during the summer. The rubrics are to be observed. The second decree (3621, 2—12th Sept., 1884) was in reply to the question whether the custom of renewing the Blessed Sacrament once or twice a month might be retained, even though the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* requires that it be renewed each week. The Congregation answered that the rule of the *Caeremoniale* is to be observed.

The *Roman Ritual* (T. V., cap. i, n. 8) instructs the Parish Priest to renew the Eucharistic particles frequently. The hosts or particles to be consecrated must be fresh, and when he consecrates them he must distribute or consume the old particles.

The frequency with which the particles are to be renewed, in Australia and New Zealand, is fixed by Decree 393 of the IV Plenary Council. 'The Eucharistic particles are to be frequently renewed, that is every week as a general rule, and the renewing of them is never to be deferred beyond a fortnight. When the priest consecrates the new hosts, he is to distribute or consume the old ones. Moreover, he is to take care that the particles to be consecrated are fresh.'

Apart from any diocesan rules that may exist, we still have no positive law determining the exact meaning of 'fresh,' and so recourse must be had to the approved authors. In formulating any general rule account should be taken of the need to exclude danger of corruption, and then of the attitude of reverence for the Eucharist which demands that we consider not merely the validity of the matter but also its perfection. The actual danger of corruption depends upon a number of elements, such as climatic conditions (corruption would occur much more rapidly in a humid climate than in a dry climate) and the quality of the flour used in the baking. Under normal conditions it would seem safe to say that a much longer period than one month would be required before there would be any real danger of corruption. But as indicated above, this is not the only consideration, and so we find that authors generally accept the norm laid down by St. Charles Borromeo that the hosts for consecration should not be more than twenty days old. As St. Charles requires by the same

law weekly renewal of the Blessed Sacrament, we reach the conclusion usually proposed by commentators, that not more than a month should elapse between the *baking* of the breads and their consumption.

Applying these rules to the case proposed by our correspondent, we must first observe that a fresh supply of altar breads only every month or six weeks is not in keeping with the common teaching of theologians and canonists. Except in very rare circumstances, it is difficult to see how any priest could be excused from procuring a fresh supply of breads at least every fortnight, which brings us more or less into line with St. Charles Borromeo's rule after making allowance for the packing and delivery of the breads. A very solid reason would be required in order that a priest might be satisfied with even a monthly supply of breads. It is well to remember, too, that the obligation in this matter is a grave one.

What of the obligation of renewing the particles in the the ciborium and Benediction lunette? The rule of the Plenary Council applies: they should be renewed every week as a normal practice, and they are never to be left more than a fortnight. This norm must be followed even though the new particles may be from the same supply as the old ones. The law makes no distinction, it simply governs the frequency of renewal, and it could well be that if the breads are stored in airtight containers they will be in a fresher condition than the hosts in the tabernacle. However, in the somewhat extreme circumstances envisaged by the present query, it is important to bear in mind, as Gasparri remarks, that the frequency of renewal must also take into account the freshness of the breads. 'And so if the hosts which are consecrated are twenty days old, the renewing of the species cannot be extended to a fortnight, because, as we said, after a month there can be some danger of corruption and irreverence. Accordingly, they must be renewed every eight days as St. Charles prescribes. Indeed, even if the hosts which are consecrated are fifteen days old, the renewing of them fifteen days after their consecration cannot be tolerated' (*De Eucharistia*, n. 1013). Hence the rule: one month from *baking* to consuming.

It will be found that the authors are generally severe in this matter, and require a high degree of diligence that cannot be fully explained by the sole consideration of the danger of corruption of the breads. Any worthy priest would not find generous compliance with this teaching a burdensome duty.

It is not without interest that some of the first legislation about the renewing of the Sacred Species came from English councils. A council of Rouen (1072) decreed that the Viaticum and holy water should not be kept for more than a week (can. vi. Mansi 20, 36). Later a council of York (1195) laid down the rule that the host should be renewed every Sunday (can. i, *ibid.* 22, 653). This ruling was repeated by another English council held in London five years later (can. ii, *ibid.* 22, 714), and by one held at Worcester in 1240 (can. vii, *ibid.* 23, 528).

FORTY HOURS' PRAYER

Dear Rev. Sir,

I am somewhat confused about the Forty Hours. Am I right in concluding from the *Ordo* that there is no commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament in the *Missa pro pace*?

What about a reference to the Preface, stating that it is the common Preface?

And what of the conclusions of the *orationes*—separate conclusions or the same conclusion?

ANCEPS.

REPLY

During the Forty Hours' Prayer the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament is added to the prayers of the Mass only when the Mass is celebrated at the altar of Exposition. In a sung Mass this prayer is added to the prayer of the day under the one conclusion (cfr. *Bugnini*, *Documenta Pontifica*, ii, p. 13, n. 21). The reason why this rule is not so evident in the *Ordo* is that the Mass *pro Pace* is not usually celebrated at the altar of Exposition.

The commemoration of a feast no longer carries with it a Preface that may be proper to it (Decree Simplifying Rubrics, III, n. 5). Furthermore, the Preface of the Nativity is no longer considered proper to the Mass of the Blessed Sacrament. In a Mass that has no proper Preface, the Preface of the season is used, if there is one, otherwise the common Preface.

The question of the addition of prayers under the one conclusion arises on days on which the votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament is excluded as the Mass of Exposition or Deposition. This Mass may be excluded because of the occurrence of an identical mystery (cfr. list in *Ordo*). On these days the Mass of the occurring mystery is celebrated without any commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament. But the votive Mass may also be excluded because of the solemnity of an occurring feast. In this instance the Mass of the occurring feast is celebrated with a

commemoration of the impeded votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament added under the one conclusion with the prayer of the feast. Finally, the addition of the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament to the Mass is forbidden throughout Holy Week.

THE ELEVATION CANDLE

Dear Rev. Sir,

In an odd church here and there I have noticed that an extra candle is lit on the altar after the *Sanctus* during Mass, which remains alight until after the Communion, and is not moved from the place where it is on the altar. On enquiry I was told that this practice is prescribed, which I doubt because it is so rare; however, if it be of obligation, should it not be generally adopted?

MASS-GOER.

REPLY

The *Rubricae generales* of the Missal (XX) state that at the Epistle side of the altar 'a candle should be in readiness for lighting at the elevation of the Sacrament.' The *Ritus servandus* (VII, 6) has this direction: 'Before the consecration, the server lights another candle, which is not extinguished until after the priest has received the Blood, or until after others have communicated, if there are others to receive Communion at the Mass.'

In 1899 the Congregation of Rites was asked whether the custom of not lighting the third candle from the Consecration until the Communion could be maintained, and it replied in the affirmative (4029, 2). Subsequently the Congregation was asked whether the local Ordinary could oblige both the secular and regular clergy of his diocese to use the third candle at Mass, even though it had long since fallen into disuse and oblivion in the diocese and in the region. The Congregation again gave an affirmative reply, making reference to the rubrics of the Missal, the authority of the Ordinary, and noting that the previous reply did not prevent the Ordinary imposing the obligation.

In practice, then, there is no obligation to use the candle if the contrary custom prevails, as would seem to be the case generally in Australia. The Bishop may, if he wishes, insist on the observance of the rubrics, and his injunction is binding.

Sometimes this candle is placed on the Epistle side of the altar, but more usually it is fixed by a bracket to the wall on the same side.

Father Jungmann, S.J., supplies the following information

regarding the origin of this candle: 'The consecration candle, from which in many places the *Sanctus* candle developed, was originally intended to be lighted and lifted aloft by the deacon or the Mass-server at the early Mass, when it was still dark, *ut corpus Christi . . . possit videri*' (*The Mass of the Roman Rite*, New York, 1955, I, p. 209). The words in italics come from a Carthusian ordinance of the mid-13th century. The use of the *Sanctus* or Elevation candle survives in Spain, Central America, parts of Europe and amongst some religious Orders.

PRAYER FOR THE JEWS IN GOOD FRIDAY LITURGY

Although there has been no notification in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, a number of periodicals (e.g., *Ephemer. liturgicae*, lxxiii (1959), p. 458) have published a direction of His Holiness, Pope John XXIII to omit the words 'perfidi' and 'perfidia' in the prayer for the conversion of the Jews in the liturgy of Good Friday.

A declaration of the Congregation of Rites, 10th June, 1948, indicated that the words *Perfidia* and *perfidi* could be translated in the sense of *infidelitas*, *infideles in credendo*. This declaration followed upon the researches of a number of scholars who established that *perfidia* and *perfidi* did not have in early Christian literature the moral sense of 'perfidious,' 'unfaithful,' or 'faithless.' Such a moral judgment was likewise contrary to the ordinary style of the liturgy. So the correct translation of the words would be 'unbelieving' and 'unbelief.'

Another characteristic of this prayer as previously found in the Roman Missal was the omission of the *Oremus*, *Flectamus genua*—*Levate* which followed the introduction declaring the intention for the prayer. This invitation to kneel in silent prayer was given before the other prayers. The reason commonly offered in explanation of the omission was that the Church did not wish us to repeat the gesture of mockery by which our Lord was dishonoured during his Passion by the Jews. This explanation is not satisfactory, because in actual fact the liturgical sources of the first nine centuries indicate no distinction between the prayer for the Jews and the other prayers of the Solemn Prayers. At the present stage, however, the studies on this point have not produced any adequate explanation of the practice which was found in the Roman Missal, but which was changed in the Restored Order of Holy Week.

P. L. MURPHY.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Homiletics

BAPTISM AND TRANSFIGURATION

1. The Baptism of Christ.

There are many incidents in the Gospels which any sensitive reader of the Gospel text—and particularly a reader whose sensitivity has been sharpened by faith—must class as ‘dramatic.’ And there are others which, without exaggeration or irreverence, might be termed ‘theatrical.’

Dramatic incidents abound in the life of Christ. There is, in the first place, an obvious and superficial drama about Our Lord’s career which will impress any reader. A carpenter’s son, Jesus is able to teach the wise, heal the sick and give life to the dead; an innocent and, seemingly, an unambitious pauper, he is flogged as a criminal and crucified as a royal pretender, and so on. Drama is born of such paradoxes as these. But there is a deeper drama, too, of which only the believer is truly aware. The man of faith will think of every word and gesture of Our Lord as an additional action in a drama of salvation which was enacted beneath the surface of Christ’s life, as it were. For him, every new situation in which Jesus finds Himself represents a fresh scene in that drama. Every happening in that life, even the most prosaic, appears portentous and precious to him. This is a drama born of faith.

On occasions, however, the drama underlying Christ’s life seems to be emphasised deliberately in the Gospels, and even to be artificially heightened—and this not by the Evangelists, who are anything but dramatists, but by God Himself! There are happenings recorded there which give the impression of being consciously ‘staged.’ They appear contrived and almost theatrical. I am thinking of events like the baptism of Christ in the Jordan and the Transfiguration, for which God Himself, intervening in a striking manner, provided a special, and quite an artificial, background. Contemplating the voices, the hovering dove, the opening heavens and the cloud, one begins first to recognise, and then to wonder at, the stage-craft of God.

In such a case to wonder is to begin to discover. Important lessons are to be learnt by considering the sample of divine histrionics provided in these two mysteries. One will discover, for example, something of the condescension of the divine artist who, having in mind the needs of man’s nature, devised these

sacred stage-effects. And one may learn a good deal, too, about the events for which they were intended to provide a setting.

Unhesitatingly we assume that there is a point to the sets which a producer chooses for his play. We expect them to accentuate at least, and perhaps even to clarify, the play's action. With the help of them, the audience comes to know the play better. In much the same way, there is point to those divine manifestations which accompanied Christ's Baptism and Transfiguration. They are relevant to these mysteries. And as well as being signs which indicate their importance in the scheme of salvation, they are aids to understanding them.

The very similarity of the signs which accompanied these events in the life of Our Lord is itself an indication of the connection between the mysteries. On both occasions, it will be remembered, a voice is heard proclaiming: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' (Mth. iii, 7; xvii, 5, etc.); in each case, amidst heavenly disturbances, something is seen to descend upon Christ—at the baptism, a dove; and a cloud at the moment of transfiguration. The similarity is surely too close to be fortuitous, and many, St. Thomas among them, have attempted to explain its significance. Aquinas, for example, arguing from this resemblance, holds that in these two events we have the two stages in the process of man's regeneration 'declared' or made clear to us.

Man's divinisation, as we know, is one single work accomplished in two distinct but connected stages. It begins with grace and culminates with glory. Our regeneration commences at baptism. This, in the terminology of St. Thomas, is our 'first regeneration,' the initial stage of the process of divinisation; and is this transformation which was represented for us in the mystery of Christ's baptism. But the culmination of man's inner renewal comes only when he is confirmed in glory. And this 'second,' and final regeneration is prefigured in the Transfiguration.

Grace is connected with, and is meant to lead on to, glory. It is, as we say, the very 'beginning of glory.' And because of this, the two realities, grace and glory, quite distinct though they are, are best understood when considered together. In much the same way, the baptism of Christ in the Jordan is connected with, and is a sort of preliminary to, Christ's transfiguration on the holy mountain. The two events are best considered together. For in fact, the meaning of the two mysteries becomes a good deal clearer when the connection between them is

remembered. No time is more suitable for reflection on these connected mysteries than Eastertide, when we celebrate the achieving of mankind's renewal through Christ's Death and Resurrection. It is now that we think gratefully of our own baptism and hopefully of a glorious transfiguration.

At first sight it is not at all clear why Our Lord should have come to the Jordan to be baptised by John. Some explanation is offered in St. Matthew's Gospel where we see Christ reassuring the reluctant Baptist with the words, 'Let it be so now, for so it becomes us to fulfil all justice' (Mth. iii, 15). One is edified at the dedication, and a trifle surprised at the complacency expressed in those words. It is the sort of complacency one associates with the person who is accurately and confidently carrying out a well-laid plan. In effect, Christ defends His action by pointing out to John that there is an order of salvation or of justice which is to be brought to fulfilment through their combined efforts; that His baptism has a part to play in the achieving of this. Apparently, then, it represents a step in a carefully-conceived plan which it is His business to implement.

This appears strange for, clearly, the rite of baptism could achieve nothing for Christ. He needed no inner purification. Conversion of heart was in His case an impossibility. But by the same token, John's baptism was not intended to achieve inner purification for any of those pious ones who received it. Certainly, it was a possible means of disposing the soul to turn with greater trust to God and to be more docile to His designs. But this was accidental to the rite's main purpose. Primarily it was intended to be a sign of man's docility, in something the same way as circumcision was looked on as being the sign of an already existing faith. Far from creating a spirit of repentance in the soul, it presupposed, and as it were testified to, its presence there. Like a coin it was a token of assets already in hand. And quite unlike the Christian sacraments, its chief value lay in the fact that it was a gesture which merely signified, without necessarily producing what it declared. In the words of Bonaventure, 'it was instituted to signify and not to cause.' By submitting to the rite suggested by John, who was God's envoy, a man gave solemn ceremonial expression to his own inner devotion to God. And at the same time he also prepared himself—and those who watched—for the subsequent reception of baptism in 'water and the Holy Ghost.'

For John's baptism was a sign with a two-fold purpose. If it

manifested something already present, it also pointed to something else that was yet to come. It was a sort of preliminary sketch of future development, a pale image of a coming reality. As a blue-print for Christian baptism, John's baptism served to show that a beginning had been made and that progress was imminent. It indicated accurately, too, the shape and the dimensions of the expansion which God had planned for the future. Through the rite administered by the Baptist, God taught men that the 'day of salvation' had finally dawned, and so aroused them to excitement and hope. Moreover, God used this as a means of familiarising men with His divine ways, gradually accustoming them to detect His demands in the words of a human spokesman and to associate the remission of their sins with a ritual bathing of their bodies, and so on. In this way John's baptism prepared Christ's contemporaries to accept and appreciate that other baptism which Christ Himself would initiate. It had reference to the future as well as to the present, and what it signified was its own eclipse.

A consequence of this is that although His reception of baptism at the hands of John could not produce any additional goodness in Christ's soul, it could still be much more than an empty formality for Him. In one sense, the rite could be as meaningful for Our Blessed Lord as it was for those others whom the Precursor and his followers baptised. For in His case, too (absolutely unique though it was), the reception of baptism could be a sign with a double function, and as such it would be useful to Christ. It would be an outward token of His willingness to be led by God; a pointer to hidden spiritual resources, the extent of which no one could possibly guess. Moreover, Christian baptism would be prepared for and prefigured in quite a special way should Christ allow Himself to be baptised by John. It does seem fitting that if Jesus is inspired to seek baptism, that ceremony should have roughly the same significance for Him as it had for others. After all, God abuses the nature of nothing He sees fit to use. Christ's reception of this rite implied approval of its usefulness, and of its usefulness for Himself personally. It was valuable to Him principally as a sign which manifested Him to those among whom He was now beginning to preach.

One realises this more clearly after examining those strange signs which accompanied Christ's ascent from the waters of the Jordan. On this occasion they serve to accentuate, and thus to clarify, the meaning of Our Lord's action. There is 'the voice from

the heavens' which says: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased' (Mth. iii, 17); or, as Mark and Luke record the incident: 'Thou art my beloved Son . . .' (Mrk. i, 11; Lke. iii, 22). And 'the Spirit, as a dove' (Mth. iii, 10) comes down from the opening heavens 'in bodily form' (Lke. iii, 22) to 'remain upon Christ' (Mrk. i, 11). Commentators may differ over the precise meaning to be attached to the Father's declaration here, but its general sense needs no explaining. It is, at the very least, an expression of the divine approval, indicating to one onlooker, St. John (Cf. Jn. i, 32ff)—if not to the crowd of those already baptised (Lke. iii, 21)—something of Christ's inner dignity. For John the Baptist the descent of the dove, too, was a sign of the same thing: 'he who sent me to baptise with water said to me "He upon whom thou wilt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, he it is who baptises with the Holy Spirit." And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God' (Jn. i, 33ff). And as St. Thomas points out in one of his commentaries on the Gospels, this is not at all surprising in view of the many Old Testament prophecies which made it clear that the Spirit of the Lord would 'rest upon' the Messiah (Cf. Isaias xi, 2).

Together these appearances prove to be the astounding realisation of a prophet's words: 'Behold my servant whom I sustain, my chosen one in whom my soul delights. I have put my spirit upon Him, in order that He may bring justice to the nations' (Isaias xlii, 1). At His baptism Jesus is declared to be the beloved of God and shown to be the recipient of the Spirit. He did not become the Son of God then; neither did He receive the Holy Spirit at that instant. But neither did those crowds who were baptised by John receive 'conversion of heart' by being bathed in the Jordan. Their hearts were already turned to God, and the rite was merely an authentication of this. In the same way the rite of baptism was a visible authentication of Christ's hidden dignity; and the heavenly voice and the descending dove were there simply to make this more explicit, or rather to reveal the true dimensions of Our Lord's dignity. These manifest Him as the divine 'servant,' and hint at His being much more. They show that in this person, outwardly quite ordinary, God finds special delight. He is led by the Spirit; on Him the Spirit rests. To Him the task of bringing divine justice into the world has been entrusted. Supplementing the rite which John administered, the divine 'stage-effects' at once clarify

Christ's action and spin a web of mystery around His person. They combine utility with artistry in a way no other 'set' ever did.

But John's baptism was also a sign of a future saving reality, a new baptism; and those manifestations of the Godhead which John witnessed at the Jordan made the rite which he administered to Christ a more perfect image of this. What was prefigured and prepared for by John's baptism was, as he says himself, a 'baptism in the Holy Spirit.' And it seems almost certain that something more general than the sacrament of Christian baptism is referred to here. It is the whole Christian economy, characterised by an outpouring of the Spirit of God, which the Baptist introduces.

The very fact of these special appearances was probably an indication that the establishing of the new economy was imminent. Pious Jews saw that when the day of salvation came, God would intervene in man's affairs in a direct and definitive way. He would make loving advances to man, draw close to the world and reveal Himself. 'I shall no more hide my face from them,' they had read in Ezechiel, 'for I shall pour out my spirit on the house of Israel' (Ezech. xxxix, 29). Obviously, the immediate significance of the theophany and the visible coming of the Holy Spirit at Christ's baptism is that God is now intervening. No longer is He satisfied to hide His face from man, but majestically, mercifully, He now reveals Himself to him.

Less obviously, but no less certainly, these manifestations mirror something of the nature of this new economy for which the Baptist was preparing. For what was accomplished then in the case of Christ, our Head, is meant to be repeated—or to speak more accurately, continued—now in the case of us, His members. Quite literally Christ's life was the model of our own. 'That which happened to Christ at His baptism,' says Chrysostom, 'pertains to the mystery of all those who would afterwards be baptised.' The Father speaks paternally of Christ; the Holy Ghost descends visibly upon Him and remains with Him. And these are happy omens for us all. The mystery of man's regeneration is foreshadowed there: his elevation to the divine sonship; his reception of the indwelling Spirit of God. And so, too, is the future sacrament of re-birth, Christian baptism. As the Spirit of God moves once more over the waters, the 'new creation' is shown to have begun.

John's baptism, and indeed John's whole life, was directed to manifesting Christ. And naturally, the climax of his efforts

came when Jesus Himself received baptism at his hands. That incident was a momentous one in the drama of salvation. It was the culmination of the prelude to that drama; the beginning of its central act. And God saw to it that it was carefully staged.

With the help of the divine apparitions, Our Lord, the central figure in the drama, was introduced to mankind at the Jordan. His status was there clearly defined: He was shown to be the Messiah, the beloved 'servant' of God, sent to bring justice to the nations. And more than that, His inner life was revealed to us: loved by the eternal Father as His own Son, He is led by the Spirit who remains over Him.

From the theophany and the visible descent of the Spirit, we are brought to realise that a divine, and indeed a trinitarian, life animates Jesus. We find that secret loves inspire Christ; that unseen influences guide Him; and that inwardly He is something much more than He first appears to be. His life, we see, is worked out on several levels. And yet His inner life is, as it were, suppressed and remains concealed. Its presence is testified to, and is not obvious in itself. What is manifested to us here is a 'carnal' Christ (Cf. I Cor. iii, 2); a Christ whose 'flesh' has a measure of mastery over His 'spirit.' The Transfiguration, although accompanied by similar signs, introduces us to a different figure.

(To be concluded)

KEVIN WALSH.

Sacred Heart Presbytery, Darlinghurst, N.S.W.

SHORT NOTICE

SIMON PETER, by Mgr. Georges Chevrot, Scepter, Dublin, 1959. Pp. XIII + 246. 15/-.

Monsignor Chevrot's book, written originally in French, has been well translated. He explains that he has collected the principal passages of the Gospels that put our Lord and Simon Peter in each other's presence. It is fascinating to see how the Divine Master fashions the tumultuous soul of the Galilean fisherman. Mgr. Chevrot's purpose, however, is to provide a meditation for priests and indeed for all, centred on these passages. An example of this is on the words: *I will make you fishers of men*, when St. Peter and his companions were "caught." The author then gives us some splendid thoughts on the role of an apostle in any century. So while this book is a sympathetic study of the great apostle, it will prove a very thoughtful book for meditation. Rarely has any very 'Frenchy' expression slipped into the translation, which is easy but dignified. Authors complain their books are not read by reviewers; the present reviewer has heard most of this book read during meals, and it stood very well up to that dread test.

T.V.

Notes

When it first appeared in 1952, Dr. Ludwig Ott's *Grundriss der Katholischen Dogmatik* was widely acclaimed and was translated into many European languages. In May, 1955, it was

translated by Dr. Patrick Lynch and edited

A RECENT by James Canon Bastible, D.D., under the
THEOLOGICAL title *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*. Three
TRANSLATION years later, a second edition appeared and

the editor, in a foreword, noted that "Dr. Ott's

work has appealed not only to priests and religious but to a very wide circle of layfolk." In this article, we shall attempt to assess the value of this English translation.

Two problems, however, confront us. Firstly, we have not been able to procure a copy of the German original and consequently we have been forced to make a comparison between the French translation, *Précis de Théologie Dogmatique* published by Salvator-Casterman in 1955 (subsequently referred to as F) and the English translation of Bastible-Lynch (subsequently referred to as E). The reader will be left to draw his own conclusions concerning the value of the English translation on the basis of this comparison.

Secondly, the number of discrepancies between the translations is so great that we have been obliged to limit our detailed comparison to a mere ninety pages (E.352-415) which cover the Sacraments in general, and the special treatment of Baptism, Confirmation and the Blessed Eucharist. Even within this narrow scope, we can select only a few of the very many discrepancies.

We may divide our analysis into two main sections. The first concerns patent errors which are found in E; the second details passages which are extremely obscure and ambiguous in E and which are presented clearly and logically in F.

A. ERRORS

E.329, line 25ff: "This may be seen, in particular, by the use of the prepositions 'out of' . . . and 'through' . . . and (in Latin) by the use of the ablative of instrumentality and of the dative." F concludes the sentence as follows: ". . . by the use . . . of the dative or (in Latin) of the ablative of instrumentality." Clearly, distinction is made between Greek which expresses instrumentality by means of the dative, and Latin which employs the ablative.

E.355, line 22: This contains a mis-translation of St. Thomas: 'cuius sacerdotio' is translated 'to whose character.'

E.337, line 9f: "Holy Scripture attests that Christ immediately instituted the Sacraments of Baptism, Eucharist, Penance and Consecration." Consecration is not among the seven sacraments instituted by Christ. It seems clear that E has translated 'Weihe' (Orders or consecration) by a meaning which is unwarranted by the context.

E.337, line 32ff: Under the thesis: "Christ fixed the substance of the sacraments. The Church has no power to alter them," we read: "It follows from the immediate institution of the Sacraments by Christ that their substance is immutably fixed for all time. The institution of a new Sacrament would involve a substantial change." The context is not directly concerned with the institution of new sacraments but with the question of substantial change in the seven. F translates the final part of the passage logically as: "Change of the substance would be equivalent to the institution of a new sacrament."

E.337, line 40ff: "Whether Christ ordained the matter and form of the sacraments specifically (in specie) or in general (in genere) is a matter of controversy, that is, whether He laid down the specific nature of the Sacrament or whether He merely gave the idea of the Sacrament in general and left the closer determination of the matter and form to the Church." All theologians agree in affirming that Christ laid down the specific nature of the Sacrament (i.e., its purpose and the graces conferred in it). F is correct theologically when it declares the matter of controversy to be whether or not Christ laid down "the specific nature of the *sacramental sign*" (i.e., the visible rite).

E.338, line 31: "For the existence of seven Sacraments a seven-fold proof can be adduced." These are then enumerated as 1. Theological Proof; 2. Proof from Prescription; 3. Historical Proof; 4. Speculative Foundation. The rest fail to appear. F invokes a "triple proof," adducing the first three and citing the speculative proof merely as theological reasoning.

E.345, line 16f: "The intrinsic ground is this that the Sacraments receive their grace of conferring power." E obviously means their power of conferring grace.

E.354, line 7ff: "By a decision of Alexander III (1159-81), rejecting a proposition of the Belgian theologian F. Farvacques, by a decision of Alexander VIII (1690), and by the declaration of the *Decretum pro Armenis* . . ." Alexander III lived 500 years before the Belgian theologian. F. correctly reads: "According to

a decision of Alexander III (1159-81), according to the condemnation of a proposition of the Belgian theologian F. Farvacques by Alexander VIII (1690) and according to the declaration . . ."

E.383, line 15: Emmanuel Maignan is designated O.Min. However Maignan was not a Franciscan as this title would indicate, but of the Order of Minims (O.Minim.) as F rightly indicates.

E.387, line 32ff: "That the worship of Latria is due to the Eucharist may be shown directly from Holy Writ in that, on the one hand, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, on the other, the right of Christ to adoration, are indicated. . . ." This can scarcely be called a *direct* proof. F correctly designates this proof as indirect.

E.392, line 11ff: "In Christian antiquity ordinary, that is leavened, bread was used also in the Eastern Church (St. Ambrose, *De Sacr.* IV, 4, 14: panis usitatus)." F correctly reads "in the West."

E.393, line 16f: ". . . to the whole prayer of thanksgiving, which is contained in the narrative of the institution." Obviously, it is the prayer of thanksgiving which *contains* the narrative of institution.

E.394, line 20f: "the recipient, the grapes into which the supernatural life of grace flows." F reads, in line with the normal interpretation of the allegory of the Vine, "the branches into which . . ."

E.396, line 33ff: "Supported by St. Augustine (sic!), St. Thomas teaches that, according to the intention of the Church, baptized persons should desire the Eucharist, since Baptism is directed towards the Eucharist, which perfects the work of Baptism, i.e., incorporation into the Body of Christ. S. Th. III, 73,3." E. misunderstands St. Thomas completely. The latter teaches not that the baptized *should* desire but that objectively they *do* desire the Eucharist in virtue of their Baptism. F gives the correct interpretation of St. Thomas.

E.405, line 19f: "the play upon words in Mt. 5, 23 et seq." In this passage there is no question whatever of any play on words. F correctly reads "the allusion to Matthew." "Anspielen" means to play or to begin to play: "anspielen auf" means simply to allude to!

E.411, line 17f: "The theory (i.e., the Mystery Theory of Dom Casel) was rejected in 1947 by Pope Pius XII in the Enc. 'Mediator

Dei'." This theory was not so much as mentioned by the Encyclical. F reads "The Encyclical 'Mediator Dei' seems contrary" to it. The difference is considerable!

B. OBSCURITIES

E.331, line 17ff: "But while these older theologians attributed to the Sacraments a physical causality in respect of the disposition mentioned, Billot ascribed to them an intentional causality, that is, they have the power of designating and communicating a spiritual conception." The latter phrase makes no sense whatever. F reads: "... Billot attributes to them an intentional causality, i.e., that they have the power of designating and communicating a spiritual disposition." This is a faithful presentation of Billot's theory. Furthermore, in the critique of the various systems of sacramental causality, E omits any reference to moral causality, though F treats it along with the other theories.

E.335, line 29: The sacramental character distinguishes "the consecrated from the non-consecrated." The religious is a consecrated soul, but is not distinguished from others by means of a character. E. really means "the ordained from the non-ordained."

E.366, line 40ff: "Christ would have instituted the Sacraments mediately only if He had left the determination of the sacramental operation of grace and of the corresponding outward sign to the Apostles and to their successors." It is fairly clear that E has translated 'Wirkung' (effect or operation) by a meaning unwarranted by the context. F reads "... the determination of the supernatural effect of each sacrament. . . ."

E.337, line 46ff: "The declaration of the Council of Trent . . . on the other hand, seems to favour specific institution, as the expression 'Sacraments,' according to the proximate sense, designates the concrete substance, that is, matter and form. . . ." F reads "... because the expression 'substance of the sacraments' designates directly the concrete substance, that is, matter and form. . . ."

E.339, line 10ff: "This is shown in its liturgical books, in its declarations at the Union Council of Lyons . . . and in its official confessional writings." F makes the last phrase clear: "in its official professions of faith."

E.339, line 17ff: "The Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople answered the Tübingen Professors . . . in association with Simeon of Thessalonica. . . ." Simeon died in 1429, 150 years before

this answer was given. F translates “. . . resting on Simeon of Thessalonica.”

E.342, line 36ff: “As an instrument is effective in virtue of its principal cause, so the efficiency of the Sacrament is independent of the subjective constitution of the minister” (who is only the secondary ministerial cause). E confuses efficiency with efficacy. F reads: “so the efficacy of the sacrament is independent. . . .”

E.343, line 44ff: “Subjectively regarded, an actual intention is that disposition of the will which is present before and during the whole action, but such a disposition is not indispensable.” Even objectively regarded, an actual intention may be so defined. F is clear: “From the subjective point of view, the ideal is an actual intention, i.e., that disposition of the will which exists before and during the entire sacramental function; but it is not necessary.”

E.346, line 8: “. . . obstacles to grace are lack of faith and unreadiness for penance.” It seems clear that E slavishly translates the word ‘Unbussfertigkeit’ which means simply, as F indicates, impenitence.

E.348, line 3ff: “The Old Testament Sacraments wrought, *ex opere operato*, not grace, but merely an external lawful purity.” Lawful means what is permitted; legal, what is according to the prescriptions of the law. F reads legal.

E.354, line 21ff: “. . . Baptism was administered in such a manner that the person baptizing, in association with the apostolic confession of faith, proposed the threefold question of faith to the person being baptized. . . .” F reads “. . . baptism was conferred under this form: the one baptizing thrice proposed to the one being baptized, conjointly with the recitation of the Apostles’ Creed, an interrogation on the faith. . . .”

E.372, line 13ff: “. . . the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) officially proposed the doctrines . . . of the exclusive consecration-power of the validly consecrated priest.” F reads: “. . . the exclusive power to consecrate of the validly ordained priest.”

E.377, line 40ff: “In association with the words of institution he concurs with the older Church tradition in expressing belief in the Real Presence.” F reads: “Resting on the words of institution . . .”

When we examine the English translation from a purely literary viewpoint, we feel no little alarm at the thought of the

book falling into the hands of an educated non-Catholic. Looseness of construction and grammatical errors abound. "The formal numeral seven presupposes a well-developed concept of a Sacrament," says the author (E.338, line 26). "Necessity is what cannot not be" (E.340, line 3) is hardly English. "Quite apart from the validity of the notions," notes E (409, line 19f), when he really means, "Quite apart from the question of the validity." "Multifold" (E.385) and "equiparation" (E.405) are certainly not found in the Concise Oxford Dictionary. We may also note a lack of consistency in the manner in which E designates persons and places, e.g., on page 381 we read St. John Damascene; over the page it becomes St. John of Damascus, and a little further down the same page St. John Damascene appears again.

Let us repeat: the errors and obscurities we have noted are but a selection of those to be found in ninety pages of the English translation. With regard to the passages mentioned—and those left unmentioned—F is consistently accurate and logical, while E is consistently inaccurate or obscure.

The patient reader of these remarks has, therefore, two choices before him: either the English translation is a faithful reproduction of the original German, and the French translation has corrected the inaccuracies and rendered startlingly clear the obscurities of the original; or the English translation is a grave distortion of the original work of Dr. Ott. Given the first alternative, we wonder why anyone should bother to translate so inaccurate and obscure a work; or why the French translation makes no mention of alterations made to the text.

Our own view is that the English translator has done a grave disservice to Dr. Ott and to the English reading public.

CAMILLUS HAY, O.F.M.,

St. Paschal's College, Box Hill, Victoria.

Book Reviews

BUT WITH THE DAWN, REJOICING, by Mary Ellen Kelly.
(U.S.A. Bruce Publishing Co., 1959. Pp. 182. 3.00 dollars.)

This is a gay, brave book—and most unusual. The author, in her thirties, is an invalid, suffering from a severe case of rheumatoid arthritis which fastened on her while she was a lively girl at high school. Five years of surgical treatment in the Catholic hospital in Sioux City were of little avail; she went home in a wheel cot which she has never left. The one big gift of surgery was to free her right arm so that she was able to write, though with difficulty. She has literary gifts; journalistic friends have helped her. Thus her special apostolate was launched, for she is the founder of the League of Shut-In Sodalists.

Mary Ellen writes: "Enrolled in Our League are twenty-five hundred sick and disabled men, women and children whom I have come to love, respect, and worry about as if they were my own family. . . . Sharing in the lives of these invalids brings strange and awesome results . . . By pooling our suffering, our sacrifices merge into one vast sea which is poured daily by Our Lady into a great golden chalice and lifted in love and reparation to Almighty God." And now we see how appropriate is the title of this book—and its sub-title, "The Joyful Answer to the Why of Suffering."

It is not a dismissal of the importance of the League to say that the real interest in this book is laughing, witty Mary Ellen herself. Sensitive and affectionate, her life as an invalid has been, and still is, one of constant struggle and triumph to her. Yet there is no self-pity; any sign of it is immediately dispelled by an American quip. Only very deep spirituality can nourish such constant joy; so, if you wish to know her secret, read first, the last chapter in this book, "Letter to an Invalid." Like the most cheerful of the saints, she goes singing on her way down the Valley of Tears.

Twice she was a member of a pilgrimage, once to the shrine of Saint Anne de Beaupre in Canada; the second time to Europe, for a visit to Fatima, Lourdes and the Holy Father in Rome. The humiliations of travel are recounted with such humour, that you go on the pilgrimage with Mary Ellen and her stricken companions, and are glad to be there. At Fatima she prayed to be cured; but that was not to be her miracle: "Several agonizing moments later, I was filled with a sweet, indescribable peace and clarity that left no room for confusion. For suddenly I knew beyond all doubt that God wanted me to remain an invalid—*complete invalid*—and that only through this physical imprisonment would I be led to eternal freedom."

M.O.

THE CURE OF ARS AND HIS CROSS, by La Varende, Trans. Jane Wynne Saul, R.S.C.J. Desclee, New York, 1958. Pp. 222. Illus.

The Cure of Ars, it must be admitted, is a disconcerting saint. Ars and its curious inhabitants seem to have no connection with life as we know it; the shocking taste in the engravings of the Cure alarms us; Mgr. Trochu and *le grappin* are stowed away in clerical minds as memories of meal-reading in the days that have gone.

Here in this book we have a new look at both the wonderful saint and the admirable Trochu by Jean La Varende. La Varende who died soon after finishing this book was a prominent and interesting novelist. A Norman nobleman, he brought a gust of wind from the 17th century into the 20th century. He knew the old France and its people. So he is able to give us a fresh picture of the peasants of Ars, the Cure and the local *grande dame*, Mademoiselle of Ars, who, to the delight of La Varende, every morning, accompanied by a faithful old manservant, recited the breviary.

M. La Varende has always admired the Cure and his book, based for the facts on Trochu, contains many personal views on the French clergy, Saint Sulpice and modern art, sly digs at political thought and so on. He points out, for instance, the close similarity between the face of the saint and that of Voltaire! But with differences, urges La Varende, who had read Saint-Simon so much, that he had gained possession of the little Duke's superb artillery of adjectives. The Cure of Ars would not let himself be photographed; so engravers were let loose to do their worst. Why did he wear his hair so long? Blame the Bishop, says La Varende, as the Bishop had decided that was *the* clerical style! The book is well illustrated—photographs of the Ars of to-day, reproductions of the popular engravings of the Cure's day, the one of St. Philomena curing the Saint, excites all kinds of emotions.

The book has been translated by an American nun, and it reads very well. It is curious to think of the clergy of Lyons "kidding" the Cure, it is strange to hear La Varende saying "A-1;" the Sacred Heart of Montmartre is straightforward. It is certain that both the Cure and La Varende would have enjoyed it. Just one little misprint, the commune of 1771 must be of 1871.

I leave the book to those who wish to read again of the saint's learning, his horror of dancing, *le grappin*, the snobs of Lyons, seen through the aggressive blue eyes of La Varende. I think they will enjoy it and get, perhaps, a clearer picture of the saintly parish priest of Ars (the translator of course has the usual difficulty with **Vicar, Curate, Cure, Chaplain**—but the French are to blame for that).

Just one more remark: La Varende, and Michel de Saint

Pierre, too, on Lourdes, are an indication that Mlle. Sagan and M. Peyrefitte are not the only French novelists.

T.V.

* * * * *

CANON LAW DIGEST IV, by T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., and James I. O'Connor, S.J., Bruce, Milwaukee, 1958; xi 529, 7.50 dollars.

The *Canon Law Digest* needs no introduction or recommendation, especially to those dealing with matters canonical. Volume III of the series included all documents issued to the end of 1952. Since that time annual loose-leaf supplements covering current matter have been published. It was the original intention of the compilers to complete the fourth volume after a ten-year period of such supplements. Owing to the vast amount of new matter collected, however, it was decided to present the matter of five years in a complete form. Volume IV is here presented as a closed volume, not to be changed to accommodate future documents. The canonist and moral theologian can only be grateful for this decision. The four volumes constitute a collection, intended to be as complete as possible, of the canonical documents issued officially since the promulgation of the *Code of Canon Law*.

The volume under review includes:

1. The documents which were officially published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* from 1st January, 1953, to 31st December, 1957;
2. other documents belonging to the same period but which were not officially published;
3. a number of earlier documents which had been unavailable at the time of printing.

Whilst the service of publishing all documents published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* would be sufficient to justify the *Digest*, the editors go further and give documents for the same period, official in character, but not published in the *Acta* and also earlier documents that have only recently become available. These documents drawn from various sources, diocesan tribunals, periodicals, etc., are invaluable and enable the canonist to appreciate and know the jurisprudence and practice of the Holy See. In this way light is thrown on such questions as impotence, *privilegium fidei*, the Oriental Code. In a word, this volume of the *Canon Law Digest* provides a complete picture of the *Code of Canon Law* in action. It maintains the high standard of the earlier volumes and retains the practice of including cumulative indices both chronological and general for all volumes. Just one observation with reference to the list of Courts of Appeal given under Canon 1594, there has been a change in some of the Australian Courts of Appeal owing to the establishment of Regional Tribunals.

T.J.C.

CONTEMPORARY MORAL THEOLOGY I: Questions on Fundamental Moral Theology, by John C. Ford, S.J., and Gerald Kelly, S.J., Mercier Press, Cork, 1958: vii 352. 30/- stg.

The names Ford and Kelly are very familiar to readers of *Theological Studies*. In all their writings they have shown themselves as thoroughly competent in the moral problems of this complex age. This first volume of a proposed series on contemporary moral theology coming as it does from such experienced men proves to be a real contribution to this branch of theology. Both theologians have the courage to take up current problems and to examine them in the light of old and tried principles. Up to date many such questions have not been adequately discussed and indeed many are not even mentioned in the standard texts. Always in their writings there is evidence of sound and balanced judgment and a real competency in applying principles. The volume under review deals with fundamental moral theology. After a complete description of the development of modern criticism of moral theology the criticism itself is examined. The assessment is both fair and objective. The authors admit that there are many deficiencies in the traditional textbook and classroom treatment of moral theology, that criticism of these is legitimate, that perhaps a new emphasis and atmosphere may be necessary. This can be provided to a great degree, they say, by the individual professor in his personal approach. They warn, however, that some of the criticisms and new approaches come close to situation ethics. They write: "It is easy for dissatisfaction with obligationism to boil over into dissatisfaction with obligation; for irritation with legalism to become irritation with law; for affection for the concrete, the personally creative and the subjectively satisfying to verge on disparagement of the abstract, universal and objective values of Christian Morality."

The same discerning and understanding approach is seen in the discussion on occasions of sin, imputability and unconscious motivation, alcoholism and psychiatry. This partial enumeration of material does not do full justice to the work and is only used by way of example. This volume does not attempt to supplant the traditional treatment of fundamental moral theology but to complement and enlarge it. It can be recommended to all students and priests.

T.J.C.

* * * * *

HEIRS OF ST. TERESA OF AVILA, by Winifred Nevin (U.S.A.: Bruce Publishing Co., 1959. Pp. 147. Price 3.25 dollars.)

Religious Orders do not always make their terrestrial journey on an even keel (may the mixed metaphor pass). We, in our time, consider the Order of Discalced Carmelites a model of charity and propriety. But when we think of the turmoil in the

Reform after St. Teresa's death, we wonder how the ship ever left port at all, so engrossed were captain, pilot, officers and mariners in urging their petty interests.

True, the sanctity of St. John of the Cross shines out with a brilliance all the more steady because of its sombre setting. Speaking of the first Provincial of the Order and the humiliations imposed on him by his enemies, the author of this interesting book contrasts the conduct there evinced, with the attitude of St. John of the Cross in similar suffering: John of the Cross is ready to perform any penance laid on him. On this the author comments: "Here the difference between the two men . . . is patent. El Santo is nothing in his own eyes. Gracian cannot bring himself to accept humiliation and the sacrifice of his dignity. It is the difference between a saint and a merely good man." And we get the impression that the "merely good" men far outnumbered the saints in St. Theresa's Reform. Still, they are worth writing about, though they died nearly four hundred years ago. The nuns made a more intelligent contribution to the settlement of the disputes.

Teresa's death in 1582 removed, at one blow, the fervent and moderating influence so greatly needed by the reformed Order of Carmel. By 1588 it would seem as if two of her trusted friends were doing their best to wreck it. There was open contention in the religious family of the Discalced between the two principal members, Fathers Gracian and Doria, on the interpretation of the Rule. The human element in both was too strong. It must have been the sanctity of Teresa and John of the Cross that saved the Order from the troubles that rent it until well into the next century.

The history of the foundations of the Discalced in France and Flanders is lightly sketched in this book. Although we knew in a general way the fine work of the early Carmelites in those countries, the hostility of Berulle tempered our admiration for him in other fields. How unpleasant people can become when nationality obtrudes itself even in work done ostensibly for God. It is on this ground that one tries to excuse Berulle, rather than include him in the generalization: that most of the suffering in the world is caused by people who like to feel important.

M.O.

* * * * *

THE LIFE OF SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS: Biographical Documents Translated and Edited with an Introduction by Kenelm Foster, O.P. xii, Pp. 172. Longmans, Green and Co. 30/- (Engl.)

Unlike St. Augustine and some other great saints, the Angelic Doctor left no account of his life or his spiritual experiences. An objectivity almost comparable with that of mathematics characterises his writings. If occasionally he refers to a former opinion of his own which he now rejects, that is as far

as his "ego" appears. Nor was there any medieval Boswell to dog his heels and mark his words outside the lecture room.

Father Kenelm Foster well says that we are accustomed to look on St. Thomas too impersonally, as a kind of embodiment of Theology, and not as a man and a saint. He seeks to make the human St. Thomas better known, and to this end has translated much of Bernard Gui's "Life," which was published some fifty years after the saint's death in 1274. Tocco's "Life" was earlier, and so probably was Calo's, but they are even less like biographies than Gui's. Passing over Tocco and Calo, the editor gives us also the relevant sections of an Ecclesiastical History by Tolomeo of Lucca, who was a young man when St. Thomas was at the height of his powers and who belonged to the same province of the order.

All these early accounts, excepting perhaps Tolomeo's, have a primitive quality which reminds us of those early painters who made no study of perspective. But what they lack in art is made up in sincerity.

One cannot help thinking that publicity will never make St. Thomas "popular" like, for example, St. Anthony of Padua. His deeds were not spectacular. To quote Gui: "Such was the normal tenor of his life—a minimum of time allowed to sleeping and eating, and all the rest given to prayer or thinking or writing or dictating. Never an idle moment, always a holy activity." (p. 37). But if he is not a saint "for the general," he certainly should be better recognized for what the Church intends, the patron saint of Catholic academies.

What impresses most about this great man is not the occasional visions, nor the miracles attributed to him, but the humility of that prodigious mind which created the *Summa Theologiae*. As the chroniclers record, when he encountered difficulties, he did not rely only on his intellect to solve them: he had recourse to prayer. If his Philosophy and Theology show us anything, it is that in comparison with God any creature is insignificant: literally nothing, except what God gives it. All created being is receiving its existence from God at every moment, and it exists only for Him. Thence emerges the truth that the paramount consideration for any rational creature is the divine good—*bonum divinum*.

Rather than these reflections, the Lives recount facts of human interest. This great professor was undeniably an absent-minded one. The incident at the table of the King of France is well known. At another time, when some high ecclesiastics came to see him he took no notice of them until his superior reminded him of their presence, and then he bowed reverently. His disciple, Reginald of Piperno, had to watch him almost continuously to protect him from accidents. He even had to put the food on the master's plate "so that he should take only what he required and avoid eating absent-mindedly" (p. 57).

Eye-witnesses at the Canonisation Enquiry concurred that he

was a big, stout man, dark and somewhat bald.

By the way, the place from which that faithful disciple and companion took his name is *Piperno* in Italian and *Privernum* in Latin, and so it is hardly correct to render Reginald's name as "Reginald of Priverno." Also the form "The Campagna" is used in this book where surely "Campania" or "Campagna" (or possibly "the campagna") is intended.

After the editor's Introduction (23 pp.), the volume contains Gui's "Life" (24 pp.), Minutes of the First Canonisation Enquiry (37 pp.), passages from Tolomeo's History (13 pp.), a few pages from the *Vitae Fratrum*, and a Letter from the Faculty of Arts in the University of Paris to the Order of Preachers lamenting the death of "the light and glory of our time." There are Notes on all these documents, and also an Appendix on St. Thomas's family and one on a sonnet attributed to him.

C.R.

* * * * *

(1) THE LIVING GOD (Trans. by Stanley Godman).

(2) THE ROSARY OF OUR LADY (Trans. by H. Von Schuecking), by Romano Guardini. Longmans Green and Company, London ("The Inner Life Series"), 1959, Pp. 200. 12/-.

(1) In introducing the author of "The Living God" the publishers claim that Father Guardini "has always made war on dead words and stereotyped concepts." The eleven chapters which make up this work fully justify that claim. Such profound but, perhaps, too thoughtlessly used terms as "The Face of God," "Providence," "The Patience of God" take on a new significance as we reap the spoils of the author's victory. He forces the reader to break the fetters of all-too-familiar terminology and guides him to new vantage points of insight into the meaning of what our words are meant to express when we speak of God.

Especially noteworthy are the sections "God Sees" and "The Will of God." In the first of "our most secret thoughts and actions" is a source of consolation, an assurance of security, not a cause of anxiety and fear. His treatment of "The Will of God" forces us to admit that we too frequently regard "God's Will" as a cold, unrelenting, external and impersonal "fate" for us. He reminds us that it is in reality "the special way in which He admonishes, urges, helps, sustains, acts and moulds struggles and overcomes and perfects inside me" (p. 40)—A timely reminder for vocational "guides" who would identify their own as "God's Will" for others!

In a work of such excellent quality as this, it is difficult to understand how certain passages crept into the text. Two examples are the following: "He (the reader) must allow a sentence to be called into question or even contradicted by another sentence, since there is no other way of giving one's ideas the dynamic impulse which will take them beyond the

limits of the purely conceptual" (p. 10).—and: "He (God) is present because He is absent" (p. 79).—The "war on dead words" appears at times to demand the extermination of basic logic and accurate statement!

This work, however, should be a source of much practical help to the preacher or catechist in treating of the subject of God.

(2) In this section the author provides us with a truly masterly treatise on a beautiful yet very difficult subject—the Holy Rosary. After much striving to follow his profound exposition of the Mystery of God in the first section, we find ourselves spontaneously acclaiming the clarity and simplicity of this second part. The contrast seems to give the lie to the titles which appear over the name of the author. Yet in this Father Guardini is true to his principle: "Only the simple things are truly great." He can claim in all justice that his work on the Rosary is truly great.

This section alone makes this book a very useful book for priests—in May and October for instructions on Our Lady and the Rosary—on any day to revive our devotion to the Rosary by way of spiritual reading and mental prayer. It would be difficult to find an explanation of the Rosary at once so clear and simple yet so full of food for mind and heart.

E.S.

Available from all Catholic Book Stores

New Books:

MAN, THE SAINT

22/6

J. Urteaga. A courageous and outspoken book which shows the immense divine value of the human virtues.

THE HOLY GHOST

17/3

Blessed John of Avila. A collection of the most beautiful and inspiring sermons of this distinguished member of the 16th century Spanish school of mystics and ascetics, now translated into English for the first time.

THE WAY OF THE CROSS. Romano Guardini

14/6

OUR LADY THE VIRGIN

24/-

Federico Suarez. 'Profound and satisfying . . . Definitely recommended.'—*Doctrine and Life*.
'A Marian masterpiece.' *Irish Catholic*.

OUR FATHER

22/6

Cardinal Grente. 'It would be difficult to imagine a better volume of spiritual reading than this.' *Catholic Herald*.
'Spiritual writing at its best.' *Catholic Times*.

OUR CATALOGUE WILL BE SENT ON REQUEST

SCEPTER PUBLISHERS LTD.

144 LOWER BAGGOT STREET, DUBLIN.